



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



HARVARD  
COLLEGE  
LIBRARY





HARVARD  
COLLEGE  
LIBRARY





**A SELF-VERIFYING**

**CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY**

**OF**

**ANCIENT EGYPT**

**FROM**

**THE FOUNDATION OF THE KINGDOM**

**TO**

**THE BEGINNING OF THE PERSIAN**  
**DYNASTY**

**A Book of Startling Discoveries**

**BY**  
**ORLANDO P. SCHMIDT**



**CINCINNATI, O.:**  
**GEORGE C. SHAW**  
**1900**

Eg-809.00



Orlando P. Schmidt,  
Burlington, N. H.

**COPYRIGHT, 1899,  
BY ORLANDO P. SCHMIDT.**

**PRESS OF  
CURTS & JENNINGS,  
CINCINNATI, O.**

## PREFACE

IN the Preface, we naturally expect the author to tell us something about his work and himself. I will avail myself of this time-honored privilege merely to say a few words about the work. As the title indicates, it is a self-verifying chronological history of ancient Egypt, from the foundation of the kingdom to the beginning of the Persian Dynasty. It covers a vast period of 3,700 years, much of which was heretofore comparatively unknown and unexplored. This field was hastily explored, usually at off-times, within the space of a few years. Armed with the "key" to the marvelous chronological system of the ancient Egyptians, which a fortuitous discovery had placed in my hands, I entered into a lost world, all recollection of which had died out, and there made a series of discoveries, and gathered together a great mass of new historical facts, the startling and far-reaching importance of which it would be almost impossible to estimate. When I first crossed the threshold of this *terra incognita*, I naturally entertained many of the views and opinions concerning the Egyptians and their religion, science, and civilization, common to modern Egyptologists in general. Some of the errors and superstitions regarding the Egyptians, which were current among so-called "scientists," were of such a preposterous nature, that my native common sense recoiled from them instinctively; but there were

others, which were of such a subtle character, and so deeply rooted, and so thoroughly interwoven with the terms, phraseology, and modes of expression in common use among all classes of readers, that I found, and still find, it almost impossible to completely free my mind from their disturbing influences.

The greater part of this book was written while the researches were being made. The author's point of view was constantly changing. The horizon was constantly widening. Each new discovery, each new fact brought to light, served to dispel the clouds and mists which hung over, and obscured from view, some of the most important periods of Egyptian history.

A book written under such circumstances naturally lacks uniformity and logical continuity. Although it was completed about a year ago, I could not persuade myself to publish it in its present form, but hoped to find the necessary time and leisure to remold it from beginning to end. This hope, I regret to say, has not been realized. The discoveries, however, are of such a nature, that I would not be justified in longer withholding them from the world. The value of the *facts* made public must be my excuse for the *form* in which they now appear.

It is due to the reader to state, that it has been my earnest endeavor throughout to get down to the bottom facts. Prior to the date of the so-called Flood (2348 B. C.) these "bottom facts" exist, and can be found, in Egypt alone. Wherever we succeed in striking "bottom facts," we have evidence of the most convincing character, evidence which can not

be successfully contradicted, evidence which may be said to verify itself. For example, the Great Sphinx, the pyramids, such as those of Nuterachi, Senoferu, Chufu, etc., the mastabas, reaching back to those of Sheri and Amten, the hieroglyphical inscriptions found in the recently opened pyramids of Unas, Teta, Meri-ra Pepa, Menthusuphis I, etc., the contemporary inscriptions of Una, Hirschuf, Aahmes, etc., the tombs and coffins of the Antefs, the statues of the Hyksos kings, the Table of Abydos, the Tablet of Four Hundred Years, the Turin Papyrus, etc., constitute what might be called the "best" evidence, that is, evidence of such convincing and unimpeachable character that no number of modern authorities could add to its weight or credibility.

For this reason, I did not deem it necessary to encumber the text with a mass of miscellaneous citations from so-called "authorities," and thereby weaken the effect of the facts presented.

The Sothiac system of chronology is so nicely adjusted in all its parts, so perfect as a whole, that no one who has made himself acquainted with its practical workings will deny that it is mathematically accurate, self-registering, and self-verifying—a marvelous piece of mechanism indeed.

Now, as modern Egyptologists, one and all, contend that the Egyptians were altogether ignorant of the science of chronology, it will be seen that I can not use them as authorities, for my discoveries place me in direct opposition to them.

It was not so with Champollion and Lepsius.



HARVARD  
COLLEGE  
LIBRARY

Shem, Ham, and Japheth are Egyptian and not Hebrew words, for example, may, at first view, appear comparatively unimportant, but who can foresee the ultimate results to which it may lead? Scientists will have to account for the remarkable coincidence between the date of the Hyksos Expulsion and the date of Jacob's birth.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that these facts affect Egyptian and Bible history only. The coming historians of ancient Greece and Rome will be called upon to account for the well-attested facts, that the Ionians (*Ia-nim*) were settled in the Grecian Archipelago and on the adjoining shores of Greece and Asia Minor as far back as the reign of Teta, or 3146 B. C.; and that the Sardinians, Sicilians, Achaians, and other Mediterranean nations invaded Egypt by land and by sea during the reign of Menophthah in the year 1491 B. C., or just before the Exodus, and during the reign of Ramesses III, or about 1417 B. C.

In the pictorial representations we see these nations clad and armed like the heroes of Homer, and, further, that the vessels in which they crossed the "Great Green" (*Uaz-ur*) Water (Wasser) were skillfully and artistically made. Many theories and notions which have come down to us from men who believed that writing was unknown in the times of Moses and Homer, that the ancient Egyptians were Hamites, or came from the fabled land of *Puon-et*, that the Latins and Ionians emigrated from the uninhabitable table-land of Aria shortly before the Trojan

War, etc., will have to yield to the inexorable logic of new and unexpected facts. Again, those Assyriologists who have published to the world artificial and fanciful chronologies of ancient Babylonia, will be forced to explain how that kingdom, which was founded by Nimrod, the son of Kush, could antedate the Hamite invasion of Western Asia, and why the native Babylonian historian Berossus did not carry his actual chronology beyond 2348 B. C., the date of that great calamity. The reader will see who, or what, the Biblical Ham really was, and that Egypt, during the two hundred and forty-two years which intervened between the Twelfth Dynasty and the Hyksos Invasion, was the school in which he and his brothers, Shem and Japheth, were educated.

A literal Flood has served as an impenetrable curtain behind which nearly two thousand years of thrilling and eventful history in ancient Egypt prior to the Hamite Invasion of 2348 B. C. was concealed from view. This book removes the curtain, and reveals the historical facts underlying the beautiful allegories, symbols, and figures of Genesis; in fact, it abounds in startling discoveries of the most profound significance relating to the earliest history of civilized man.

Let no one think, because I have been compelled to assail some of the theories advanced by modern Egyptologists, that I do not fully appreciate the grandeur and importance of the work they have accomplished. On the contrary, I regard it, beyond a doubt, as one of the grandest achievements of the

human intellect. In the galaxy of immortal scientists, none shine with a brighter light than Champollion, Lepsius, Bunsen, de Rougè, Brugsch, and Maspero. They were banded together in the cause of science and truth, which the Egyptians symbolized and personified as Thoth and Maat, and I am satisfied that no one will be more ready to accept the truth and discard old errors than those who still survive. The world is indebted to them; how much more so must I be.

To my friend, L. A. Wood, author of a remarkable work, yet unpublished, entitled "The Trial and Test of the Gods in Egypt," to whom I communicated many of these discoveries at, or about, the times they were respectively made, I am indebted for many valuable hints and suggestions. In fact, he is the only person known to me who seems to have anything like a true conception of the religion of the ancient Egyptians, that is, their wonderful doctrine of "Life."

Although the Egyptians engraved the mystic words, "the Way (*uac*), the Truth (*maat*), and the Life (*anch*)," in imperishable granite, Egyptologists have persistently closed their eyes to the fact; but the author of "Osirian Christianity" has not done so.

I also wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to my wife, to whom this work is gratefully dedicated, for valuable assistance in its preparation.

ORLANDO P. SCHMIDT.

MAPLEHURST, KENTON CO., KENTUCKY, }  
July 19, 1899. }



## INTRODUCTION

**MODERN EGYPTOLOGISTS**, after vainly attempting to work out a consistent system of chronology for ancient Egypt, have abandoned the task in despair. This has been briefly pointed out in the chapter headed, "Present State of Egyptian Chronology."

Instead of frankly admitting this, however, some of them have resorted to the questionable expedient of trying to put the blame upon the ancient Egyptians, charging that they were ignorant of the science of chronology, and, consequently, had no chronology, or chronological system. Thus all of the otherwise excellent histories of ancient Egypt lack a chronological basis, or support. The maximum and minimum dates for the accession of *Mena*, the first king of Egypt, for example, differ fully two thousand years. This confusion is not confined to the Old Empire alone, but undermines and honeycombs the entire structure down to the beginning of the reign of Psammetichos. None of these histories gives us one solitary date during this period of 3,579 years, which is correct. The trouble is steadily growing, instead of diminishing, and the latest chronologies, when compared with those of Bunsen and Lepsius, are simply preposterous.

Now this work is merely a *chronological*, not a general history of ancient Egypt, and, as its primary object was to supply what is wanting, restore what

has been lost—not to copy, or simply repeat, what is already familiar to every student of ancient history—the chronological element has been naturally forced into the foreground. But the reader may ask: “Why do you attach so much importance to an accurate and reliable chronology? Is it not a dry and uninteresting subject at best?” My answer to these questions is, that history without an adequate chronological support is little better than fiction, is like music without time; in a word, chaos and discord. Chronology is dry and uninteresting only when separated from the historical events to which it relates; as, for instance, in chronological tables drawn up for ready reference, but never when used as the legitimate basis, backbone, prop, and support of history.

In order to see how indispensable chronology is to reliable history, the reader is requested to examine the latest histories of Rawlinson, Brugsch, Wiedeman, Maspero, or Petrie with reference to the following special periods, to wit:

1. The 350 years of the first “ten Thinite Kings,” from the accession of *Mena* (4244 B. C.) to the beginning of the first Memphite Dynasty (3894 B. C.)

2. The 214 years between 3894 B. C. and 3680 B. C., during which the Memphite Kings of the Third Dynasty and the Thinite Kings of the Second Dynasty reigned side by side.

3. The 148 years which intervened between the downfall of the Old Empire (2948 B. C.) and the beginning of the Twelfth Dynasty, or Middle Empire (2800 B. C.)

4. The 242 years between the close of the Twelfth Dynasty (2590 B. C.) and the so-called Hyksos Invasion (2348 B. C.)

5. The 511 years of so-called Hyksos domination over Egypt, including the 259 years and 10 months of the Seventeenth, or Hyksos, Dynasty.

6. The 237 years of the actual Nineteenth Dynasty, beginning with Ramesses II Miamen, and ending at the Sothiac Era, 1324 B. C.

7. The 185 years of the Twentieth Dynasty, ending 1139 B. C.

8. The 220 years of the Twenty-second Dynasty, ending 789 B. C.

9. The 65 years of the contemporaneous Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Dynasties, beginning 730 B. C., and ending 665 B. C.

The reader will find that the first two of these periods (erroneously estimated at 779, instead of 564, years) are characterized as "mythical," and treated accordingly.

A lot of so-called "myths" is served up to the reader, instead of historical facts.

The third period (supposed to cover 849 instead of 148 years) is in hopeless confusion and obscurity, little better, indeed, than chaos. Petrie even ventures to place the *Hyk-sat-u* (Hyksos) King "*Achian*" here.

The fourth and fifth periods are in an equally chaotic condition. The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Dynasties are regarded as successive, when, in fact, they were contemporaneous, and the sub-totals which have been ignorantly substituted for the original

totals of these dynasties are accepted as genuine and correct, and the ridiculous attempt is soberly made to squeeze 136 kings and 937 years into a period of 242 years. The Hyksos Dynasty, which came in 251 years after the Hamite Invasion of Egypt, or 2097 B. C., is either placed at the beginning of the Hyksos period of 511 years, or about 100 years after it, so that, in the nature of things, nothing definite, certain, or reliable can be expected here.

When we reach the Eighteenth Dynasty, there is but little improvement. Egyptologists still cling to the date 1648 B. C., as an absolute beginning point for this dynasty, as a drowning man clings to a straw, and they cut down and bend and twist the numbers, reigns, and dates in vain attempts to make them conform to, and harmonize with, this date, which can be traced to a silly blunder made by Josephus. The Nineteenth, Twentieth, and Twenty-second Dynasties have suffered most from these unwarranted changes. In fact, the Nineteenth and Twenty-second Dynasties have been almost blotted out. The last period above-named, although comparatively recent, is in an equally chaotic condition. The epoch-title "Rokchoris" does service as an actual king who was taken and burnt alive by the Ethiopian King Sabako. Tarako and Sabako appear upon the scene interchangeably, and their reigns are made to overlap and interfere in a most inexplicable way, so that the reader is completely bewildered and mystified. The native kings, Tephnachtis, Nechepsos, and Nechao, float around *in nubibus* without a place or date.

---


The above instances have been singled out at random, but every dynasty during the entire period of 3579 years is more or less affected by the doubt and uncertainty, not to speak of the errors, which are due to the absence of a reliable chronology. When Egyptologists bound themselves down to the *a priori* assumption that the ancient Egyptians were unacquainted with the science of chronology, and had no chronological system or era, they necessarily barred the way to further progress; for no sane man would seek for that which he thinks he knows does not exist. Here again we see the fatal effects of errors introduced more than 1,800 years ago. When Josephus contended that before Abram came into Egypt the Egyptians were unacquainted with arithmetic and the science of astronomy, and that Abram himself communicated to them these parts of knowledge (see *Antiquities*, Book I, Ch. 8, Sec. 2), he certainly viewed the subject from the Roman and Hebrew, or, I might say, Asiatic standpoint; for he betrays no knowledge of Egyptian affairs prior to the date of Abram. But when modern Egyptologists undertake to build systems upon such false and thoroughly-exploded contentions, they are altogether inexcusable.

"Truth is stranger than fiction." At the beginning of the kingdom, or as far back as 4244 B. C., the Egyptians had the most accurate system of chronology ever devised by the ingenuity of man. It sounds like the irony of fate to say that this system was purely and strictly astronomical. In a word, they had and used the marvelous, self-verifying.

self-registering system of chronology known as the "Sothiac."

While I am free to admit that the Sothiac system, with its peculiar and distinctive nomenclature, titles, etc., presents a number of formidable-looking difficulties to the general student, yet I am convinced that any one can easily master it by carefully perusing the first part of this work. A general knowledge of the Sothiac system is also indispensable to a correct understanding of the much-abused chronological lists of the celebrated Egyptian priest and historian, Manetho. These lists were copied by Manetho from the ancient registers preserved in the temples of Egypt, and, before they were systematically changed and falsified by the early Jewish and Christian chronographers, were as accurate and reliable as the celebrated astronomical "Canon of Ptolemy." The fragments of the Turin papyrus still show that these ancient registers reached back to the earliest times. The reigns of Mena and his successors upon the throne were carefully registered in years, months, and days, and (what is equally important) were accurately adjusted to the Sothiac eras and epochs. The epoch-reigns, identified by appropriate epoch-titles, enable us to readjust the separate reigns to absolute dates, astronomically fixed, and thus restore the chronology upon a reliable basis.

Unfortunately, the breaks in the Turin papyrus were of such a nature as to destroy many of the epoch-reigns; but several of them, like that of *Ian-ab-ra* of the Fifteenth Dynasty (2064 B. C.) have escaped in-



tact, while others are indicated by parts of the stereotyped formula, "*ari-en-ef em suteniu.*"

The Sothiac system is fully explained in Part I of this work; but it can do no harm to add a word or two by way of introduction. The ordinary or vague year of 365 days (being about six hours short), shifted or receded one day in four years, one month in 120 years, and one entire year in 1,461 vague years. The Sothiac year grew out of, and was based on, this regular shifting of the vague year. Thus a Sothiac day was equal to four years, a Sothiac month to 120 years, a Sothiac year to 1,461 years. There were twelve Sothiac months of 120 years each, to the last of which (Messori) twenty years were added. These twenty years corresponded to the five intercalary days of the ordinary year.

A Sothiac year, therefore, consisted of 365 Sothiac days of four years each, or 1,460 fixed years. The heliacal rising of the Dog-star Sirius, called Sothis (*Sopdet*) by the Egyptians, regulated the Sothiac year. Thus the 120 years during which Sothis rose heliacally in the month of Thoth of the vague year, constituted the Sothiac month of Thoth.

In the fixed year, as we shall see, Sothis rose heliacally, in the latitude of Heliopolis, on the first day of Pharmuthi, which is about July 19th; and the first day of Thoth, or the beginning of the year, coincided with the winter solstice. When Sothis rose heliacally on the first day of Pharmuthi of the vague year, which was the case in the years 4864 B. C., 3404 B. C., 1944 B. C., and 484 B. C., the year was

normal; but when Mena mounted the throne, for instance, it had shifted 155 days, so that Sothis rose on the first day of Thoth, which was likewise the first day of the year. These 155 days represent exactly 620 years. This rising of Sirius on the first day of Thoth, 4244 B. C., marked the date of the establishment of the kingdom, and likewise the end of the 1255 years of the "manes," or saints (*achiu*).

The practical working of the system may be provisionally illustrated by the epoch-reign of Amenes I, who came about one cycle, or 1,460 years, after Menes. It came to pass that Sothis rose heliacally, that is, just before the sun, on the first day of Thoth, in the seventeenth year of the reign of this king. The great automatic, self-registering time-piece of Egypt indicated that 1,460 years had elapsed since Mena became king. Thus, after Amenemes I had reigned sixteen years (it should be fifteen or sixteen years, x months and x days) the Sothiac month of Mesore (and a Sothiac cycle likewise) came to a close, and the Sothiac month of Thoth (and a new Sothiac cycle likewise) opened. This important event happened in the year 2784 B. C. Amenemes I reigned sixteen years before, and thirteen years after, this date—in all, twenty-nine years.

This much is simple enough; but the epoch-titles assumed by, or conferred on, these epoch-kings present more difficulty. As we shall see, the government of Egypt was modeled after the solar system. Pharaoh claimed to be the successor, or vicegerent on earth, of Ra, or the sun. It was assumed that he ruled

the world as Ra rules the solar system. He was the central orb, giving light, life, stability, happiness, etc., to all peoples. He assumed the titles of Ra, and, in the symbolical language of those times, the ruling powers, with Pharaoh at their head, constituted the "heaven," just as the subject people constituted the "earth."

Again, according to the cosmic theory of the Egyptians, nothing came into existence except by generation of male and female parents, etc. Thus primeval Ra, after throwing off, or giving birth to, the planets Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Earth, Venus, and Mercury, grew old and passed away, and was succeeded by Horus, or the present sun. In the ordinary and Sothiac years, Horus, as Harpokrates (*Har-pachrat*) or "Horus, the Babe," was born at the winter solstice, or beginning of the year; became physically developed, as *Har-ka-nacht*, "Horus, the powerful Bull," at the vernal equinox; reached his intellectual perfection, as Ra, at the summer solstice, or "heart" of the year; and eventually grew old (*as*) and very old (*as-as*), as Tum, Atum, or Osiris, at the autumnal equinox. From the vernal equinox to the autumnal equinox he was in the upper hemisphere, or sphere of light; but from the autumnal equinox to the vernal equinox he was in the lower hemisphere, or sphere of darkness. Now, as the sun of the Sothiac year reached the winter solstice in the seventeenth year of the reign of King Amenemes I, he assumed the title *Nem-mestu*, meaning "Re-born," in commemoration of his birth as Harpokrates. His position at the head

of a new Sothiac year is indicated by the title *Amen-em-het*, or "Amen at the head."

But as he became identified with the Sothiac month presided over by Thoth, he received another distinctive epoch-title, to wit: Petithothis (*Pa-ta-tahu-ti*) or "The Gift of Thoth."

It is significant that the title assumed by Mena, one complete cycle earlier, related to the Sothiac month alone, for Athothis is the Egyptian *Aa-tahu-ti*, having the meaning "Hermogenes," or "Offspring of Thoth."

Now let us explain what we mean by an "epoch-reign." *Kebahu*, the last king of Manetho's First Dynasty, reigned twenty-six years, of which three were before, and twenty-three after, the epoch of Athyr, 4004 B. C. His epoch-reign survives in the Lists of Manetho as "Uennephis" with twenty-three years. As we shall see, Uennephis is taken from *Uon-nofer*, "Perfect Being," or "Perfect One," a distinctive title of Osiris, the consort of Hathor or Isis. Eratosthenes, however, used the reign *before* the epoch as the epoch-reign. Usertasen II and Usertasen III reigned together jointly for many years. Eratosthenes grouped the two reigns together as fifty-five years. It happened that the thirty-eight years of Usertasen III were equally divided by the epoch of Paophi, 2664 B. C. Eratosthenes had them ruling as Hermes and Herakles, that is, in the Sothiac months of Thoth and Paophi, for fifty-five years; but he also had Usertasen III reigning as Phuoro, or Nile, for nineteen years, which is his reign *before* the epoch

---

2664 B. C., or the beginning of the month of *Pa-hapi*, or The Nile.

It will be seen from the foregoing illustrations that we must endeavor to make ourselves acquainted with the primitive arrangement and division of the year, the names and symbols of the months and seasons, and the attributes and titles of the so-called deities who were supposed to preside over the same.

We must also examine the peculiar religious notions of the Egyptians, in connection with their theory of the formation and government of the solar system.

Manetho and his chronological lists necessarily come in for a share of our attention, for the lists were copied from the ancient registers, and, while we are enabled to restore and verify them by means of the Sothiac system, they, in turn, reflect a bright light upon the practical application of the system. The chronological numbers of Josephus have been briefly considered, because they were the indirect cause of the arbitrary changes and alterations made in Manetho's lists by the early Jewish and Christian chronographers, and as such enable us to detect the same. All this the reader will find in Part I of this work, which is introductory to Part II, where the chronological history from the foundation of the kingdom, 4244 B. C., to the beginning of the Persian dynasty, 525 B. C., that is, *the work proper*, will be found.

The chronological part of the work, in which grand-totals, like the 3,555 years from the beginning of the Third Dynasty to the end of Nektanebos' reign; sub-totals, like the 453 years of Theban, and

511 years of Hyksos, domination; dynastic totals, like the 263 years of the Eighteenth Dynasty; epoch-reigns, like the 23 years of Seti I after 1584 B. C., and the separate reigns, combine to form a wonderfully harmonious structure, covering over 3,700 years of actual and well-authenticated history, amounts to a mathematical demonstration; and, as the reader will see, has been subjected to every conceivable test. The synchronisms afforded by the Bible narrative and by the histories of Babylonia, Assyria, Greece, etc., have been carefully applied, and, although Africanus and Eusebius have been criticised for attaching too much importance to synchronisms, the remarkable results attained will speak for themselves.

In the face of much nonsense written on the subject, it is self-evident that no artificial chronological scheme could for one moment bear the "crucial test" of an absolute astronomical system, even in one particular, much less throughout its entire extent.

The epoch-reigns of Zet, or Saïtes, Neko II, and Nechtharebes, at the very end of the scheme, are brilliant demonstrations of this. Every discovery which was made in Egypt, or came to the author's notice while the work was in progress, has tended to support, corroborate, or verify it.

In conclusion, the reader is requested to bear in mind that the subject is novel and difficult, that the details and ramifications are myriad, and that the author has been able to derive but little assistance from other sources.

## PART I

### The Sothiac System of Chronology and the Chronological Lists of Manetho

---

#### AN INTRODUCTORY STUDY

---

#### PRIMITIVE ARRANGEMENT AND DIVISION OF THE YEAR

THE winter solstice is the scientific beginning-point of the year. The birth of Christ, or Christmas, should therefore be celebrated at this time. The old year dies, and the new year is born, when the sun, having reached his lowest point in the southern hemisphere, *reverses* his course. The name of the first month, January, is derived from Janus, a Roman, or Etruscan, god. The name, as now pronounced in English, is misleading. The correct pronunciation is "yan-us," or, divested of the Latin termination *us*, "yan." We are told that Janus had two faces, looking in opposite directions; that the month of January was consecrated by offerings of meal, salt, frankincense, and wine, all of which had to be *new*; and that on the first of this month presents were exchanged and all enmities suspended. The temple of Janus stood near the Forum, but was in reality only an

arch, or gateway, facing east and west. It seems that no one has been able to discover the nature and origin of Janus; but the reader will have no difficulty in understanding all about him when the meaning of the Egyptian *an* or *ian*, which has come down to us in the familiar forms "Iannus" and *Pa-ian*, has been explained.

The arrangement and division of the ancient Egyptian year was far more scientific than our own. Its beginning point was the winter solstice. Its culminating or turning point, called *an* or *ian* by the Egyptians, was the summer solstice. These two points were called "horns," and the name of one of them survives in Capricorn, "the horn of the goat." The "northern horn" is now called *Cancer*, or Crab, which is symbolically the same as *Ian*. Compare the German "*Wende*" and the *an* of the word answer.

The scientific division of the year was into four parts. This fourfold division was made by the winter solstice, vernal equinox, summer solstice, and autumnal equinox, represented respectively by the first day of the months of Thoth, Choiahk, Phamenoth, and Paoni, and coinciding approximately with December 21st, March 21st, June 21st, and September 21st of our mode of reckoning.

The equinoxes also served to separate the upper and lower hemispheres. The upper hemisphere was symbolized as *Har*, or Horus; the lower as *Set*, or Seth; and it was but natural that the former was associated with light and goodness, the latter with darkness and evil. These conceptions were old and al-

ready crystallized when the "Pyramid Texts" of *Unas*, *Teta*, and the *Pepas* were engraved, about 3146 B. C.

The same idea controlled the arrangement of the day, in which the horizon took the place of the equator, and in which midnight was the winter solstice, sunrise the vernal equinox, noon the turning point, or "wende," and sunset the autumnal equinox.

The life of man, from birth to death, served to illustrate the course of the sun alike in the day and the year. At the winter solstice the sun was born as *Har-pa-chrat*, or Harpokrates, "Horus the babe;" at the vernal equinox, or sunrise, he was *Ka-necht*, "the powerful bull;" at the summer solstice, or noon, he was *Ra*, that is, fully matured physically and intellectually; and at the autumnal equinox, or sunset, he was *Tum*, *Atum*, and Osiris. These distinctive names were varied by numerous other poetical and symbolical titles, which are quite confusing to the beginner, many of which will be commented on and explained in this work.

It seems that each of these four divisions of the year was presided over by one of the so-called "gods" or personifications. I was first led to this conviction after examining the astronomical tablet misnamed "Stela of Cheops' Daughter," published in Maspero's "Dawn of Civilization." The tablet is divided into four horizontal sections, the uppermost of which contains five standards, to wit: the ibis, or Thoth; the sparrow-hawk, or Horus; two wolves, or jackals, or the twins; that is, the double-faced Janus of the summer solstice; and the mummy Osiris. As the eminent

Egyptologist, Maspero, has spoken of this tablet, as follows:

“One would like to possess some of those copper and golden statues which the Pharaoh Cheops consecrated to Isis in honor of his daughter. Only a representation of them upon a stela has come down to us”—my unsupported opinion might not have weighed much with the general public, but, fortunately, the spade has turned up the missing evidence in ancient Babylonia, where it lay buried for centuries. I now notice, for the first time, in Smith’s “Assyrian Discoveries,” page 404, etc., that an astronomical tablet shows the following “method of arranging the year:”

“1. From the 1st day of Adar to the 30th day of Iyyar, the sun is fixed in the season of the *great goddess* and the time of showers and warmth.

“2. From the 1st day of Sivan to the 30th day of Ab, the sun is fixed in the season of *Bel*, and the time of the crops and heat.

“3. From the 1st day of Elul to the 30th day of Marchesuan, the sun is fixed in the season of *An-u*, and the time of showers and warmth.

“4. From the 1st day of Kislev to the 30th day of Sebat, the sun is fixed in the season of *Hea*, and the time of cold.”

Thus each of the four seasons in Babylonia had its tutelar deity. The Cushites brought this arrangement with them from Egypt, and it was but slightly modified to suit the seasons of Babylonia. The first season, called the season of the “great goddess,” *i. e.*, Isis,

or Hathor, commenced at the vernal equinox, and corresponded to the Egyptian months of Choiahk, Tybi, and Amhir. The second season, or the season of Bel, commenced at the summer solstice, and corresponded to the Egyptian months of Phamenoth, Pharmuthi, and Pachons. These months were sacred to *Ra*, who is here represented by the Babylonian Bel. In like manner, the season of *Ânu* commenced at the autumnal equinox, and covered the Egyptian months of *Pa-uon-i*, Epiphi, and *Mes-har-i*, of which *Tum*, or Osiris, was the tutelar deity. The city of *Ôn*, or *Ânu*, was the ancient site of Osiris. The symbol, or hieroglyph, which stands for *Ânu*, is placed at the head of this season, and always marks the western horizon and autumnal equinox.

The season of Hea commenced at the winter solstice. Hea was "the god who knew all things," the counterpart of Thoth. Thus we learn that each of the four divisions of the year had its appropriate symbol, the same represented on the so-called "Stela of Cheops' Daughter."

By the side of the fourfold division of the year, which was strictly scientific, there was another division into three seasons of four months each, which originally corresponded approximately to the actual seasons in Egypt. There are really but three seasons in Egypt: the season of the inundation, when the valley of the Nile is an inland sea dotted with island-cities; the field season, devoted to agriculture; and the dry season, in which the grain is stowed away in anticipation of the next inundation.

The first season was called the *Sha-et* season. The word *sha-et* means "field," and the hieroglyph with which it is written represents a field covered with growing plants. This season commenced, in the fixed year, at the winter solstice, and embraced the months Thoth, Paophi, Athyr, and Choiak. These names, however, were not given to the months originally. The primitive scientific enumeration was as follows: the first month of the *Sha-et* season, the second month of the *Sha-et* season, and so on to the fourth month of the *Sha-et* season. In the inscriptions, the months are invariably designated in this way, and never by their names. From the 21st of December to the 21st of April, the Egyptians were engaged in agricultural pursuits, and Egypt itself was a field teeming with crops and plant-life in general. Although this season was appropriately called the "Field Season," it did not actually begin immediately after the inundation, but was made to agree with the beginning of the year according to the scientific division.

The second season was called the *P'ru-et Season*, from *p'ru-et*, *p'ru-e*, *p'ro*, meaning "grain" or "granary." The four months of this season were long afterwards named Tybi, Emhir (Mechir), Phamenoth, and Pharmuthi. Wilkinson rendered them in the Coptic: Tubeh, Emshir, Baramhat, and Baramudeh.

This season was distinctively hot and dry. The fields, which had been verdant with luxuriant vegetation, were now as parched and barren as the surrounding desert itself. The Nile was at its lowest

stage, a succession of sluggish channels winding their way among sandbars.

All that remained for the people to do was to store the harvests, particularly the *grain*, in the granaries, rendered "treasure cities" in the authorized version of Scriptures. A better, or more descriptive, name than *P'ru-et*, or *P'ro*, could not have been devised for this season.

The third season was called the *She*, that is, "Sea, or *She-mou*, season," which is equivalent to the high water, or inundation, season. This season comprised the months Pachons, Payni, Epiphi, and Mesori.

The month of Pachons of the fixed year commenced about the 21st of August. The Nile reaches its lowest stage about the 21st of June, and then begins to rise at Elephantinè, which is on the southern frontier of Egypt. It continues to rise for about one hundred days, at the end of which period, or about the 1st of October, it reaches high-water mark, and resembles an inland *She*, or sea. After remaining stationary for some time, moistening and fertilizing the fields, it begins to slowly recede. The annual inundation has been so often described in ancient and modern works, and is already so familiar to every class of readers, that we feel justified in omitting any further description of it, merely wishing to call attention to the fact that the season characterized by this remarkable phenomenon of nature was most appropriately named by the ancient Egyptians.

Modern Egyptologists, disregarding the plain

meaning of the hieroglyphs, have changed the field season into the water season, the grain season into the field season, and the water season into the dry season, in order to make them agree with their preconceived theories regarding the Egyptian year and seasons. The word *She*, or sea, for example, is followed by the three wave-lines, which stand for *mou*, "water," and are always used as the *determinative* for water. Thus there is no excuse for rendering it the dry season.

When the Egyptian year was divided into these three seasons of four months each, Sothis, or Sirius, rose heliacally on the first day of Pharmuthi, of the vague year, which then coincided with the 19th of July. The first historical cycle and the beginning of Menes' reign date from 4244 B. C., when Sothis rose with the sun on the first day of Thoth. This fact demonstrates that the primitive arrangement and division of the year was made long before Menes' reign, and certainly not later than 4864 B. C., during the 1,255 years of the *Ach-i-u*, or "Saints," erroneously rendered "heroes."

We have fixed the "Rising of Sothis" at, or about, the 19th of July, which is the *mean* date, and requires some explanation. When the year was divided, the center of Egyptian civilization was around the city of *Ânu*, or On, afterwards called Heliopolis. Before the kingdom was founded, this city was the capital of the principality called *Ta-ânu*, "Land of On," and *Ta-ânnut*, "Land of the City of On." *Tha-ânnut* (or

Theânut, as it was pronounced in Lower Egypt), gave rise to the Greek forms "The-einites," "Thenites," "Thynites," and "Thinites," which led to the error of assuming that Mena came from the little town of This, near Abydos, in Upper Egypt.

The absolute astronomical dates which will be established throughout the entire course of Egyptian history, from 4244 B. C., to 525 B. C., where we connect with the accurate astronomical "Canon of Ptolemy," render it certain that the observations were made in the latitude of Heliopolis, and that *Anu*, and not This, was the capital, or center, when the division of the year was made.

### THE TWELVE MONTHS

Long before 4244 B. C., when the kingdom was established, the Egyptians had divided their year into twelve months of thirty days each. Five intercalary days were *added* to the last month, Messori, which, thus, had thirty-five days. This year of 365 days lacked about six hours of being complete. It was the so-called *vague*, or shifting, year, in common use among the Egyptians, the great, automatic, self-registering timepiece of the Sothiac year. For this reason, it was regarded as sacred, and preserved inviolate and unchanged. By the side of this *vague* year, there was, from time immemorial, a fixed year of  $365\frac{1}{4}$  days, carefully regulated by astronomical observations, and notably by the heliacal rising of Sothis. The division of the year into twelve months of thirty

days each, supplemented by a "little month" of five intercalary days, was more scientific than might be supposed at first blush. It is a well-established fact that the motion of the earth around the sun is more rapid in winter than in summer. Hence there are but ninety days between the winter solstice and the vernal equinox, the dates of which are commonly fixed respectively at December 21st and March 21st. Placing the beginning of Thoth at the winter solstice, the first of Choiak would approximately coincide with the spring equinox. It is true that the beginning of Phamenoth, in the fixed year, did not exactly coincide with the summer solstice, but the agreement was close enough for all practical purposes. If we were to place the beginning of January at the winter solstice, where it belongs, the beginning of July would also be a day or two before the summer solstice. The practical advantage of uniform months of thirty days each would certainly outweigh these slight discrepancies. The great advantage of this arrangement of the year and months, from the Egyptian point of view, was the "Rising of Sothis" on or about the first day of Pharmuthi of the fixed year. Owing to his uniform brightness, Sirius, or Sothis, was at all times the most available fixed point in the heavens by reference to which the earth's position in her orbit could be easily determined.

The *names* of the months are so important, in connection with their *recession* in the Sothiac year, that they will be now considered separately, beginning with Thoth.

First Month of the *Sha-et* Season, called Thoth.

The arrangement and division of the year, as handed down to the Egyptians from the prehistoric age, was purely scientific; hence it was ascribed to Thoth, the "Lord of Writings," the symbol and personification of wisdom and science.

The first month of the year, which was likewise the first month of the first season and first division of the year, was called Thoth. The Sothiac year, with which we are chiefly concerned, was regulated by the heliacal rising of Sirius. In the fixed year Sothis rose heliacally on the first day of Pharmuthi, and the winter solstice coincided with the first day of Thoth; but it was almost the reverse of this in the Sothiac year. The "Rising of Sothis," on the first day of Thoth, marked the beginning of a new Sothiac year. This took place during the period covered by this work, in the years 4244 B. C., 2784 B. C., and 1324 B. C. Each of these years, therefore, marks the beginning of a Sothiac year, or cycle, and constitutes an important era.

As the Egyptian Government was patterned after the solar system, the king who happened to reign at the beginning of one of these epochs was regarded as an epoch-king, and received an appropriate epoch-title. Pharaoh was supposed to rule the *world* (two lands, two hemispheres, upper and lower hemispheres, etc.), as Horus did the planetary system, and was described as being in the same Sothiac months or signs, and as sharing the same successive stages of growth, development, and decay, from birth to adolescence, maturity, old age, and death. As a natural result of

this, we find a bewildering variety of epoch-titles borne by successive epoch-kings. Some of these titles are simple and transparent. Thus Mena, who headed the Sothiac cycle, 4244 B. C., was called Athothis, or *Aa-tahu-ti*. The meaning of this title is "Offspring of Thoth," or, as Eratosthenes rendered it in Greek, "Hermogenes." Menes, the first king of Egypt, reigned sixty-two years after the epoch 4244 B. C., under the epoch-title of "Athothis." In this instance, therefore, the title was taken from the *name* of the so-called tutelar deity, Thoth, and explains itself.

It usually happened that the reign of an epoch-king did not begin with the epoch, but was divided by it into two unequal parts. In such cases we have the reign *before* the epoch (the epoch-reign according to the Turin Papyrus and Eratosthenes), the reign *after* the epoch (the epoch-reign according to Manetho), and the *entire* reign. Thus Zet, or Saïtes, the Sethon of Herodotus, reigned forty-four years, of which six years were *before* the Sothiac Epoch, 724 B. C., and thirty-eight years, *after* it. All these numbers survive in the lists, and appear at three distinct reigns.

The heliacal rising of Sothis on the first day of Pharmuthi of the *vague* year, for instance, correctly marked the year 3404 B. C. in the Old Empire.

Second Month of the *Sha-et* Season, called Paophi.

As Horus was born at the winter solstice, he was represented in the month of Thoth as a youth wearing the sidelock, and in the month of Paophi as a reclining sphinx. His distinctive title in this month was

*Ken*, "Brave," (Kühn), or *Ken-ken*, "Very Brave." The Greeks identified him with their Herakles. King Atoth, of the First Dynasty, who reigned thirty-one years after the beginning of the Sothiac month of Paophi, 4124 B. C., therefore, received the epoch-title "Kenkenes," *i. e.*, *Ken-ken*. The name Paophi, however, is *Pa-api*, "The Nile." The corresponding sign of the zodiac is still known as "Aquarius." The Nile was also called *Pa-ior*, "The River," which explains "Phuoro," or "Neilos," the epoch-title given to Usertasen III in the List of Eratosthenes during the nineteen years of his reign before the epoch of Paophi, 2664 B. C.

The king who reigned at the beginning of the Sothiac month of Paophi, 1204 B. C., a Ramesses of the Twentieth Dynasty, was familiarly known to the classic writers as "King Nile." As his reign extended from 1207 B. C. to 1168 B. C., he was on the throne at the date of the Fall of Troy, 1181 B. C.

Third Month of the *Sha-et* Season, called Athyr.

Athyr is known to be a form of Hathor. *Ha-et Har* originally meant "House of Horus," that is, the cosmic abode from which he emerged at sunrise. In the year, it was the sign immediately below the equator, from which Horus arose at the vernal equinox, when he crossed the equator and entered the upper hemisphere. In the "Stela of Cheops' Daughter," Hathor is represented as a mermaid, half-woman, half-fish (compare the Grecian notion of Aphrodite rising from the foam of the sea).

This sign, which was the "House of Horus," *before* the vernal equinox, was simply "*Hus-et*," the "Abode," and *Hus-iri*, the "Abode of the Eye," *after* the autumnal equinox. Isis and Osiris are the Greek forms of *Hus-et* and *Hus-iri*. *Haet* and *hus* are the prototypes of "house" and "hut."

The epoch-king of Athyr, 4004 B. C., was "*Kebahu*," the last king of Manetho's First Dynasty. He received the epoch-title "Uen-nephis," that is, *Uon-nofer*, "Perfect One," or, as some might prefer, "Perfect Being." *Kebahu*, the king, was identified with Osiris, the consort of Isis, and not with Hathor, and received one of the distinctive titles of Osiris, to mark him as an epoch-king.

We shall see why the birth of Adam was fixed at the epoch of Athyr, 4004 B. C., by the later Bible chronologers.

Fourth Month of the *Sha-et* Season, called Choiak.

The symbol of Choiak in the "Stela of Cheops' Daughter" is an agricultural offering. The hieroglyph for Bast (*Bastet*) seems likewise to represent an offering of the same nature.

At the beginning of this month, *Har-ka-necht*, "Horus, the powerful Bull," crosses the equator, and enters the northern hemisphere, awakening the vegetable world to life. In the Old Empire, *Chem*, or *Min*, and the Mendesian Ram (*Ba-neb-ded*) served as symbols for this month; but they were afterwards supplanted by *Bastet*, the goddess of *Bubastis*. All of these were simply personifications of the "generative,"

or "procreative," power in nature, for which reason the symbol *Bastet* was itself sub-symbolized as a cat.

In the same way this month was also associated with the *manhood* of Horus. Macrobius says: "Hæ autem ætatem diversitates ad solem referuntur, qualem Ægyptie proferunt ex adyto die certa, quod tunc brevissimo die velut parvus et infans videatur: exinde autem procedentibus augmentis, æquinotio vernali similiter atque adolescentis adipiscitur vires figuraque juvenis ornatur," etc.

*Pa-ta-bast-et*, or "Petubastis," "the Gift of Bast," for example, was the epoch-title of Osarkon II from and after the epoch of Choiahk, 964 B. C.

**First Month of the *Peru'-et* (P'ro) Season, called Tybi.**

The name Tybi is derived from the *teb* of *Tef-teb*, one of the designations of the lion-headed goddess *Tef-nut*, who was undoubtedly the tutelar deity, *i. e.*, symbol, of this month.

The king of the Twenty-second Dynasty, who reigned at the beginning of this Sothiac month, 844 B. C., bore the name *Pa-mui*, "The Lion," which he must have assumed before the epoch, for he ascended the throne in 848 B. C. Here name and epoch-title were identical (as they were with Unas), presumably because four years only intervened between his accession and the epoch.

The epoch 844 B. C. divided *Pa-mui's* reign of seventeen years into two parts, to-wit: four years *before*, and thirteen years *after*, the epoch, both of which

have been unwittingly preserved in the Pseudo-Sothis List of Syncellus, so that his date can be fixed with mathematical certainty.

Shortly after the close of the Twenty-second Dynasty, we find, in the same Sothiac month, a king of Memphis and Sais bearing the name *Tef-necht*, or "Tephinachtis," that is, "Victorious *Tef-nut*."

In the Turin papyrus the name of *Zoser-sa-f*, who reigned to the epoch of Tybi, 3764 B. C., heads a rubric, and is written in red ink. He is the "Soyphis" of Manetho, the "An-soyphis" of Eratosthenes. Unless he ceased to reign in 3764 B. C., *Zoser-teta* is the name borne by him after the epoch. Manetho rendered this name Tosortosis, or Sesortosis. It has also come down to us in the forms "Sesonchosis" and "Sesostris," which are evident corruptions. Dikæarchos mentions this Sesortasis, and fixes his date at 2,500 years, in round numbers, before "King Nile," that is, at about 3707 B. C.

Second Month of the *Peru'-et* Season, called *Emhir*.

The name Mechir, generally applied to this month, is confusing. According to Wilkinson, the Copts called it Imshir, which varies but little from the original Egyptian, *Em-hir* or *Am-hir*. *Hir* is the highest sign in the sun's apparent annual course; therefore, when Horus reached it on the first day of this month, he was said to be *em hir* (from *hir*, "above," "high"), that is, "in the highest sign." This month enjoyed an unusual variety of descriptive titles. We find one

king bearing the title "Ameris," a corruption of the Greek form "Amiris" (from *Am-hir-i*). In this sign the sun was in his greatest *splendor*. *Chufu I*, who reigned at the beginning of the Sothiac month of Emhir, 3644 B. C., bore the epoch-title "Mechiris," *Mechir-i*, now Bicheris, and the title *Hir*, which expressed it in one word. As the sun *ascended* through this sign during this month, to immediately *descend* through it in the following month, Emhir and Phamenoth were regarded as "twins," and represented as twin wolves facing in opposite directions. Emhir was called *Rohk-ur*, "great heat," while Phamenoth was called *Rohk-nez*, "little heat." King Bokchoris, whose connection with "great heat" has given rise to a legend as tragic as it is touching, is but a slightly-modified Rokchoris (*Rohk-ur-i*). Egyptologists have sought in vain for a king bearing this name, but they may be assured that they will never find him, for his name was *Zet*, the Sethon of Herodotus, and his epoch-title "*Rohk-ur-i*," or Rokchoris, alone gave rise to the silly story that he was "burnt alive by Sabako."

Third Month of the *Peru'-et* Season, called Phamenoth.

The Greek form of the name of this month, Phamenoth, is as misleading as Mechir. The Copts pronounced the name "Paramhat," which leads unerringly to the original *Pa-ra-am-hat*, meaning "the sun at the middle, or *heart*," of his course. This "highest point" was the *an* or *ian* (turning point) which we have already explained while treating of

Janus. On the first day of "Paramhat" the sun began to retrace his course, and was, therefore, likened to a crab. As the highest sign was compared to the face (*hir*), which is *above* the body, so was this highest point, to the crown, which is worn on the *top* of the head. The king of the Fourth Dynasty, who had the good fortune to head this Sothiac month, 3524 B. C., was called *Cha-f-ra*, the "Crown of Ra" (*i. e.*, "Ra, his crown"), and also bore the title *User-hat* in commemoration of the sun's arrival at the *heart*, or middle, of his course.

The Hyksos king who came 1,460 years later received the title *Paian*, since converted into Baian. A successor of this king called himself *Chian*, or, as I conceive it, *Ach-ian*, and, besides the customary titles, bore the unusual title *Hyk-satu*, "Ruler of Foreign Countries," from which Hyksos is derived.

In the "Stela of Cheops' Daughter" the two wolves serve to mark this great turning point. King Neco's title, *Nem-ab-ra* (*ab* for *hat*), "Renewed is the Heart of Ra," had direct reference to this middle point, 604 B. C.

Fourth Month of the *Peru'-et* Season, called Pharmuthi.

Paramudeh of the Copts resembles the Greek form Pharmuthi so closely that it affords us but little assistance in discovering the original form of the name. The first of this month, in the fixed year, coincided with the "rising of the divine Sothis." When the sun began to descend he was no longer Horus, but

*"Ra"*—the old primeval *Ra*. Horus was the son of Isis and Osiris; but this primeval *Ra* was the son of *Neith*, the "great mother." Instead of *Sa-neit*, he was generally called *Sa-muthi*, or, with the definite article, *P'sa-muthi*, which was rendered "Psamuthis" by the Greeks. We might be tempted to believe that *Pharmuthi* was simply a modified form of *Phrasamuthi*, were it not for the fact that *Ra* at this time was supposed to embark in his boat, or ark, on his southward journey. In the "Stela of Cheops' Daughter" there is a representation of this ark, or great bark, which makes it more probable that *Pharmuthi* stands for the sun in his bark. There are hundreds of allusions to the two barks of *Ra*, *Semkutet* and *Madet*, in the "Pyramid Texts." A celebrated queen of the Eighteenth Dynasty bore a name which is rendered *Mut-em-ua*, but means "Muth in the bark," which is analagous to *Pa-ra-em-mud-et*, the only difference being that the mother (*Neith*) is substituted for her son *Ra*. If one simple fact had been heeded, to wit, that this "great mother" was called *Neith* at Sais, *Isis* at Busiris, *Hathor* at Ânu, *Muth* at Thebes, etc., many voluminous works on the religion of ancient Egypt would not have been written and published.

In the Table of Abydos, the last king of the Fourth Dynasty is called *Shepses-ka-f* (*Sebescheres*); but in the lists of Manetho his place is usurped by the unintelligible title "Thamphthis," which appears as "Pammes" in the list of Eratosthenes. This is an instance in which an epoch-title has found its way into the lists by the side of the real name of the Pharaoh;

for, as we shall see, when we come to examine the epoch-reigns, Shepseskaf reigned nine years after the beginning of the Sothiac month of Pharmuthi, 3404 B. C., under the epoch-title of "Psamuthis."

"Pammes" and "Thamphthis" bear but a faint resemblance to Psamuthis, yet it is possible to follow the successive changes which have led to these corruptions in the original Greek. Eratosthenes translates Pammes "Archondes," from *archon*, which refers to Ra, the son of Neith, who had passed the summit of life and was growing old.

The Hyksos king who reigned one cycle after *Shepseskaf*, to wit, 1944 B. C., received the title "*Asas*," meaning "very ancient," which now appears in the lists as Assis, Ases, and Aseth. The name of this king was *Set-nubti*, rendered "Sethos" by Manetho. The form Aseth is a blending of *Asas* and Seth. The celebrated "Tablet of Four Hundred Years" dates from *Set-nubti* and the epoch 1944 B. C.

Psamuthis, who now fills the place of Psametichos II of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, was the epoch-king of Pharmuthi, 484 B. C. As there was no place for him in the Persian Dynasty, some one substituted him for Psametichos II.

First Month of the *She-mou* Season, called Pachons.

There seems to be no difference of opinion among Egyptologists as to the derivation of the name Pachons; they all concede that it is derived from *Chons*, the moon, who, according to Theban notions, was the

"peace-loving" son of Amen and Muth. As we shall see, he was substituted for *Seb*, or the earth. The moon seems to move more swiftly than any of the planets, owing to the fact that she revolves around the earth. It was this swiftness of motion which gave rise to the name "Chons." On the first of this month the sun entered the last sign in the upper hemisphere. At the end of this month he ended his career as Horus, and became *Tum*, *Atum*, or Osiris. In order to understand why the moon was associated with this month, we must bear in mind that, in the formation of the solar system, the earth belongs here, and the moon simply takes the place of the earth. In the four-fold division of the year, Bel or *Ra* presided over the months of Phamenoth, Pharmuthi, and Pachons.

The titles descriptive of the Sothiac month of Pachons are *Amen-ir-tais*, "Amyrtaios," "Ammonodotos," "the Gift of Amen" (lit. "Amen makes the gift"). *Aahmes*, "child of the moon," *Pa-ta-chons*, "Petichons," "the Gift of Chons," all of which will receive our attention in the part of this work devoted to the epoch-reigns.

Second Month of the *She-mou* Season, called Paoni or Payni.

The beginning of this month, as we have seen, coincides with the autumnal equinox. *Ra* crosses the equator and enters the lower hemisphere, where he becomes *Tum* or Osiris. *Uon-as*, "Ancient One," as we have also seen, was a title of Osiris. Paoni and Payni are forms of *Pa-uon-i*. The last king of Mane-

tho V's Dynasty, who headed this Sothiac month, 3146 B. C., reigning sixteen years before and eighteen years after the epoch, assumed the title itself, pure and unchanged. In fact, *Uonas* seems to have been his only name and only title. The inscriptions recently discovered in his pyramid contain the following passage:

*"Up-uk huset-uk em pet em abu en pet enthut as diu uatha."* "Thou takest thy place in heaven, among the planets of heaven, behold! thou art the evening star." *Uonas*, as Pharaoh, represented the sun just above and below the equator, which was equivalent to the western horizon in the day, and the above allusion to him as "evening star" was for the purpose of symbolically marking this position. It was not intended that any but the initiated should understand this. Thothmes III, epoch-king in 1704 B. C., introduced a new epoch-title, *Cha-em-uas*, "Chamois," "Crowned in Thebes," but also bore the title *Har-em-achu*, "Harmachis," "Horus on the Horizon," which is so plain that it requires no further explanation.

We have seen that *Ânu* stood as the tutelar deity of the fourth division of the year, which commenced at the autumnal equinox, and we find that Thothmes III was the first to assume the title *Hyk-ânu*, "Ruler of On."

In the Third Cycle this epoch fell in the Ptolemaic period, where Ptolemy *Euergetes* appears to remind us of *Uon-nofer*, "the Good Being," a title used interchangeably with *Uon-as*.

Third Month of the *She-mou* Season, called **Epiphi**.

Epiphi is plainly *Apapi* as pronounced in Lower Egypt. *Ap-ap* was the "giant snake," or "great dragon," the symbol of evil and wickedness, the "lord of darkness," the great adversary of Osiris, in one word, the Egyptian devil.

*Nofer-ka-ra Pepa*, the "Phiops" of Manetho, who reigned from his sixth to his one hundredth year (not one hundred years) was the epoch-king of Epiphi, 3044 B. C., and is called "Apappus" in the List of Eratosthenes. "Apappus" is not, as some might suppose, a Greek form of the monumental *Pepa*, which Manetho rendered "Phiops," but *Ap-ap-i*. There can be no mistake about the identity of "Apappus," for his phenomenal reign of one hundred years could only belong to *Nofer-ka-ra Pepa*, whose pyramid at Sak-kara has furnished us with a volume of ancient hieroglyphic inscriptions, in which his name appears hundreds of times.

It is hard to say when and why *Set* became identified with *Apap*. The Hyksos kings had a fancy for the names *Set* and *Apapi*; one of them bore the name *Set-nub-ti*, or Sethos, and two of them the name Apophis. They identified *Set* with their *Sutech*, and the unquestioned fact that these *Aamu* (Hamite) invaders of Egypt were "serpent-worshipers" makes it very probable, indeed, that *Sutech* was regarded as the "great serpent." Be this as it may, it is certain that immediately after the Hyksos Expulsion *Set* and *Apap* were looked upon as almost identical.

One of the most interesting epoch-reigns to be found in the annals of Egyptian history is that of *Seti I*. This king reigned thirty-six years (including his joint-reign with Ramesses I) in the month of Paoni and twenty-three years in the month of Épiphi, that is, from 1620 B. C. to 1561 B. C., the epoch being 1584 B. C. The first thirty-six years of his reign were given to *Sa pa-uon-i*, which now appears as "Spanios," a name characterized by Bunsen as preposterous and nonsensical. Thus we see that, according to the Egyptian way of thinking, *Seti I*, during these thirty-six years, reigned as the "Son of Paoni." His reign as "Osirapis" will be explained under the appropriate head.

In the good old times, as shown by the so-called "Stela of Cheops' Daughter," *Ptah*, bandaged as a mummy, stood for this month, which agrees with the ancient conception of *Ptah* as the creator of the visible world, who here precedes the birth of *Har-pa-chrat*, the infant Horus. It was for this reason that Seti was also called *Mer-nu-ptah*, "Menophthah," "Beloved of Ptah."

Fourth Month of the *She-mou* Season, called Messori.

The birth of the infant Horus occurred at the end of the year, or the winter solstice. The birth of Horus, *Mes-har-i*, gave its name to this month, which was the last month of the Egyptian year. Unfortunately, the epochs of Messori, 2924 B. C. and 1464 B. C., both fell in periods of anarchy and obscurity,

and, to add to the confusion, the separate reigns of these periods are now entirely wanting in Manetho's lists.

Harpokrates was identified by the Greeks with Herakles, while *Har-pa-chrat*, "Horus the Infant," was called *Sem-su*, "the eldest," by the Egyptians. Eratosthenes has a king, No. 26, whose name now reads "Semphrukrates," translated "Herakles Harpokrates," with a reign of eighteen years. It is plain that this is an epoch-title, and that the name "Semphrukrates" was originally *Sempsu-Harpokrates*, both of which have come down to us in these forms. At the bottom of these lies the original *Sem-su Har-pa-chrat*. The reign of eighteen years exactly fills out the interval between 2942 B. C., when the Seventh Dynasty came to an end, and the epoch of Messori, 2924 B. C. This reign further shows that the first king of the Eighth Dynasty reigned at least eighteen years, although there were in Egypt at this time at least three separate and distinct lines of rulers.

The date of the succeeding epoch of Messori was 1464 B. C., or just twelve years after the death of Menophthah. The reign of Chamois (*Cha-em-uas*), "Crowned in Thebes," reached to this epoch. The king to whom this title belonged was *Sa-ptah*, "son of Ptah," who was afterwards deposed and driven from Egypt by *Set-necht*.

The last epoch of Messori coincided with the birth of Jesus; but an error of several years was made when the Christian Era was determined and established, which was centuries afterwards.

## THE SIGNS OF THE ZODIAC DERIVED FROM THE SYMBOLS OF THE EGYPTIAN MONTHS

The signs of the zodiac, to which we have been accustomed from earliest childhood, were derived from the symbols of the Egyptian months. The science of astronomy, as taught in Egypt, was carried to Babylonia and surrounding countries shortly after the Hyksos Invasion, and, although it was changed in many particulars to conform to new conditions and local notions, many surviving features enable us to trace it back to its original home on the banks of the Nile.

For reference and comparison, the months and corresponding signs are now placed in parallel lines:

| Months.      | Signs.      | Approximate Dates.   |
|--------------|-------------|----------------------|
| 1. Thoth     | Capricorn   | Dec. 21 to Jan. 21.  |
| 2. Paophi    | Aquarius    | Jan. 21 to Feb. 21.  |
| 3. Athyr     | Pisces      | Feb. 21 to Mar. 21.  |
| 4. Choiahk   | Aries       | Mar. 21 to Apr. 21.  |
| 5. Tybi      | Taurus      | Apr. 21 to May 21.   |
| 6. Emhir     | Gemini      | May 21 to June 21.   |
| 7. Phamenoth | Cancer      | June 21 to July 21.  |
| 8. Pharmuthi | Leo         | July 21 to Aug. 21.  |
| 9. Pachons   | Virgo       | Aug. 21 to Sept. 21. |
| 10. Paoni    | Libra       | Sept. 21 to Oct. 21. |
| 11. Epiphi   | Scorpio     | Oct. 21 to Nov. 21.  |
| 12. Mesian   | Sagittarius | Nov. 21 to Dec. 21.  |

### THOTH OR CAPRICORN

After the downfall of the Old Empire, 2948 B. C., Thebes gradually gained the ascendancy, until, under the Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and Twentieth Dynas-

ties, it became the capital of Egypt. At the time of the Exodus, Thebes was called *No*, "The City," and *No-oâ*, "The Great City." The Thebans placed *Amen* at the beginning of the year, and, as the goat was one of the symbols of Amen, this "horn" of the year became "Capricorn," from *caper*, "goat," and *cornu*, "horn." At the head of the Second Cycle, 2784 B. C., we find *Amen-em-het* (Amenemes), "Amen at the head," who assumed the additional title *Nem-mestu*, "Reborn," "Again-born." The "hidden," or concealed, God was called *Men*. His symbol, or hieroglyph, was the bolt. When the Egyptians cried out to the invisible and hidden God, entreating him to manifest, or reveal, himself, they used the exclamation, "*Amen!*"

#### PAOPHI OR AQUARIUS

We have seen that the name of the second month was *Pa-api*, "The Nile." The definite article *Pa*, prefixed to *Api*, shows that this name originated after the Old Empire. Aquarius, "The waterman," is certainly an adaptation of *Pa-api*. The two wave-lines used to represent Aquarius are taken from the three wave-lines employed by the ancient Egyptians to represent *mou*, "water."

#### ATHYR OR PISCES



As *Hact-har*, Hathor, was the "house," or abode, from which Horus arose at sunrise, so was *Hus-ct*, Isis, the abode into which *Tum* retired at sunset. Hathor and Isis represent the sign immediately below the equator, the former at sunrise and the vernal equinox, the latter at sunset and the autumnal equi-

nox. On the so-called "Stela of Cheops' Daughter" Hathor is pictured with the head and upper body of a woman, and the lower body of a fish, rising, apparently, out of the cosmic ocean. It is natural, therefore, that she was identified with Venus Aphrodite, who was supposed to rise from the foam of the sea. The conception of Venus as morning and evening star, and of Hathor and Isis, was necessarily a *dual* one. For this reason, the "house" of Horus and the "house" of *Tum*, although, in fact, one, were represented as two fishes. "Pisces" still stands for these two fishes of ancient Egypt.

#### CHOIAHK OR ARIES

Most Egyptologists derive Choiahk from *Kahir-ka*, "Chief Bull" (lit. "Bull above Bull"). In the Table of Abydos the second king of Manetho's Second Dynasty is called *Ka-kau*, rendered "Kaiechos" by Manetho. Inverting Manetho's softening process, a form resembling Choika, Choiak, might be easily evolved from *Ka-i-ka*. Of one fact there can be no possible doubt: this month symbolized the reproductive power in nature. As we have already seen, a variety of symbols was employed in different parts of Egypt, such as the Apis-bull, Mendesian-ram, Bubastite-cat, etc.

The Cushites, who founded the first kingdom in Babylonia, were derived from the original Hamite settlement in the Delta, and naturally adopted the peculiar notions of that section of Egypt, their prin-



cipal city being Avaris, on the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, afterwards occupied by the Hyksos. Aries, the ram, is the famous Mendesian-ram, whose worship (?) is said to have been instituted by "Kaiechos." The "golden calf" of the Hebrews was another Lower Egyptian symbol of this month.

#### TYBI OR TAURUS

Although the name Tybi seems to be derived from *Tef-teb*, one of the forms of *Tef-nut*, this month was originally sacred to Horus *Ka-necht*, "the powerful bull," whom no one could withstand. "Taurus," the bull, is a survival of this powerful bull.

#### EMHIR OR GEMINI

Emhir and Phamenoth both represent the highest zone traversed by the sun in his yearly course—the zone through which he ascends in the month of Emhir and descends in the month of Phamenoth. These two months, therefore, were symbolized as "twins," "twin-wolves," "great heat," and "little heat," etc. The sign Gemini now alone preserves the most ancient designation, "twins." One of these wolves, on a standard, and facing *left*, can be seen in the famous representation of Chufu I and Chufu II, in the peninsula of Sinai, where it marks the Sothiac month of *Em-hir*, 3644 B. C., for the wolf of Phamenoth faces to the right.

Under the wolf of *Chufu* there is a representation of *Har-ti-ma*, "Horus the Lancer;" in other words,

Horus, with the lance directed against the most northern point in the heavens to which the sun is allowed to attain, and prepared to thrust it back when it reaches that point.

#### PHAMENOTH OR CANCER

The first day of Phamenoth marks the turning-point, *an*, or *ian*, in the sun's course above the equator. *Cancer*, or the Crab, is the appropriate symbol of the sun's backward, or retrograde, course after the summer solstice. This turning-point, or highest horn, was sometimes called *cha*, "crown," sometimes *hat*, "heart." The title of *Cha-f-ra*, *User-hat*, "Wielding the Heart," marks this point in the Sothiac year, 3524 B. C., as does the later title, *Pa-ian*, mark it in 2064 B. C.

#### PHARMUTHI OR LEO

The lion is supposed to symbolize the fierce heat of the July sun. *Rohk-nez*, "little heat," would hardly seem to agree with this idea of fierce heat, were it not that "great heat" and "little heat" are merely distinctive names for the twin-months, both of which were distinguished for the fierce heat of the sun, which was rendered still more oppressive and unbearable by the total want of moisture and desert-like barrenness of the land. *Rohk-ur* and *Rohk-nez* were twins, of whom one now retains the name Gemini and the other Leo.

#### PACHONS OR VIRGO

The "virgin," who now takes the place of *Chons*, is more ancient than the Theban notion of the gentle



and peace-loving son of Amen and Muth. This month was originally represented by *Seb*, whose consort was the virgin *Nut*, whom the Greeks called *Rhea*.

The name of *Nut* is generally followed by *pet*, "heaven," or *hir*, the determinative for heaven, which demonstrates that from the earliest times she was regarded as the *heavenly* virgin. When Bunsen wrote his famous work, "Egypt's Place in Universal History," it was supposed that the conception of Osiris was a comparatively recent one; but the inscriptions in the pyramids of Unas, Teta, Pepa, etc., show that Osiris, *Seb*, *Nut*, and nearly all the other so-called deities of ancient Egypt, date from the prehistoric age. The idea of the "father," the "virgin," and the "son," is also prehistoric, and, although the "triad," at different historical epochs, bore different names, it was, in fact, always the same. Thus we find *Seb*, the father, *Nut*, the virgin, and Osiris, the son, in the Pyramid texts, just as we afterwards find *Amen*, the father, Muth, the mother, and Chons, the son. In all these triads, we must bear in mind that father, virgin, and son, are symbols, not entities or realities.

Virgo, who now lends her name to this sign of the zodiac, is the heavenly *Nut*, the virgin mother of Osiris, who was called the "perfect one" and "the ancient one," and symbolized light and goodness, concord or harmony, peace and happiness. This virgin, the "great mother," the "queen of heaven," the "inscrutable *Neith*, whose veil no mortal could lift and live," had such a hold on the minds of the inhabitants

of Lower Egypt, that the Theban notions of Amen, Muth, and Chons were never able to supplant it. This accounts for the Babylonians and those who have obtained the signs of the zodiac from Babylonia, having this primeval virgin. The substitution of *Chons*, the moon, for *Seb*, the Earth, was the result of evolution, but not in the direction contended for by Darwin.

#### PAONI OR LIBRA

Since we know that the beginning of the month of Paoni coincided with the autumnal equinox, when the sun was balanced over the equator, and not with some other season of the year, as supposed by Egyptologists who have preceded me, the perfect applicability of Libra, or the Balance, is manifest. The Egyptians had a variety of expressions, illustrative of the sun's position over the equator. As we have repeatedly stated, the equator of the year occupied the same position as the horizon of the day.

*Har-em-achu*, "Horus on the horizon," therefore, was equivalent to Libra, or the sun over the equator. We have also shown that, when the sun sank below the equator, or horizon, he became Osiris, and that this month bore one of his titles, *Pa-uon-i*.

The primitive arrangement of the months was purely scientific, and therefore ascribed to Thoth. Many symbolical notions were engrafted on the original scientific scheme in the course of succeeding centuries, but in the case of Libra the scientific idea has come down to us unaffected by the thousands of years which have elapsed since it was first evolved.

## EPIPHI OR SCORPIO

*Apap*, the "giant snake," *Selk-et*, the "scorpion," and the hippopotamus, the hog, and other brutal and ferocious animals, were symbols of Typhonic *Set*, "the lord of darkness." In the Pyramid Texts (which are nearly one thousand years older than the establishment of the kingdom of Babylonia by the traditional Nimrod), *Selke* appears, written phonetically, *Selket*, and followed by the picture of a scorpion as a determinative. The idea of the "scorpion," therefore, is as ancient as that of *Apap*, and both are equally Egyptian. It is probable that the boa-constrictor of Southern Egypt was at the bottom of the Upper Egyptian symbol *Apap*, while the Scorpion of Lower Egypt was the corresponding symbol in the Delta. The fact that *Ptah* fills this place in the "Stela of Cheops' Daughter" indicates that the idea of the "serpent," "dragon," and "scorpion," is a later modification, or, I might say, corruption, of the primitive scientific arrangement. After the Egyptian priests commenced to use the symbols of wickedness to terrify and intimidate the uneducated masses of the people, they naturally sought out and adopted the most repulsive creatures they could find. Did not Dante, in his *Inferno*, succeed in reaching the utmost extremes in this field of typhonic monstrosities to which the most morbid imagination could aspire to go?

## MESORI OR SAGITTARIUS

The name Messori is not the symbol from which Sagittarius was derived. The ideas associated with

the last month of the year were necessarily complicated. The old year expired, to be followed by the birth of the new year. Osiris, the symbol of light and goodness, concord and harmony, etc., was murdered by Typhon, the "old serpent," the "red dragon," the "symbol of darkness and wickedness," etc., to be in turn slain by the avenging dart of the youthful Horus, whose birth at the end of this month is expressed by "*Mes-har-i*." The Babylonians represented this according to their own notions. It is plain, however, that Sagittarius, the "Archer," riding over the prostrate form of the wounded serpent, is this same avenging Horus. The Egyptians themselves sometimes represented this sign as *Sate*, the "arrow," which was in turn emblematic of the dissipation of darkness by the rays of light shot forth by the new-born sun.

### FORMATION OF THE SOLAR SYSTEM

The "nebular hypothesis," which was first advanced in modern times by the German philosopher Kant, was the "A, B, C," of the ancient Egyptian science of astronomy. The old sun, called *Ra*, was originally evolved out of a "nebula," or chaotic mass. The planets, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Earth, Venus, and Mercury, were portions of this old sun, successively "lifted up," or thrown off, in the form of rings like those still revolving around Saturn. Upon collapsing, these rings, obeying a well-known law of nature, formed globes and condensed into planets. As Saturn was the outermost planet known to the Egyp-

tians, *time* did not begin until he commenced to revolve in solitary grandeur around *Ra*. The extract from Manetho transmitted by Eusebius, according to which no time was assigned to Hephaistos (*Ptah*), the architect or "modeler" of the solar system, shows that there was as yet no succession of day and night, no revolution of a planet around the central mass, no standard by which time, as we understand the term, could be measured. Saturn, therefore, became identified with *time*, and he is certainly the planet originally known to the Grecians as "Chronos." This planet in the course of time evolved a planetary system of his own, a beautiful system of moons and rings, and in this way became at first a subordinate *Ra*, and eventually a subordinate Horus. Now, as the planets were composed of matter torn off from the body of *Ra*, and "lifted up" on high above his equator, this process was appropriately, though symbolically, described as a *birth*. Thus *Ra* gave birth to Saturn, and in this sense was called the father of Saturn. This notion of generation and birth was transferred and applied to "successor," so that Osiris, who was identified with the planet Venus (*Isis*), was sometimes called "the son of *Seb*," that is, the "successor" of the planet *Seb* (Earth).

Jupiter, who was also a secondary sun, was likewise called *Ra* and Horus; in fact, owing to his size and brilliancy, was pre-eminently the Horus among the planets. Mars, or *Menthui*, was the third planet generated by *Ra*, so that *Seb*, or the Earth, was still a part of the sun for many years after the birth of

*Menthu.* This fact gave rise to a legend, according to which Ra once reigned upon the earth. Thus there were three planets above the earth; and this was another reason why they were each denominated Horus, from *har*, or *hir*, "above."

The earth (being man's *habitat* and point of observation) became the equator of the solar system as known to the ancient Egyptians. Saturn, Jupiter, and Mars were *above* the earth, or man's plane of observation, and, therefore, in the upper hemisphere. Venus, the "star of Isis and Osiris," "the star which conveyed the '*Benu*' (Phoenix, Venus) of Osiris;" and Mercury, "the star of *Set*," or Typhon; and Horus, the new sun, the babe of the winter solstice, were *below* the earth, and, therefore, in the lower hemisphere. It must be borne in mind, however, that this science, in its original purity and perfection, came from primitive man, from the venerated *ach-i-u*, or "saints," and was prehistoric. In the course of centuries the Egyptians were no longer able to fully understand or grasp it. The facts were obscured by a cloud of symbols, legends, and allegories dexterously woven around them by cunning priests.

Our mental vision enables us to follow the successive formation of Ra, or the old sun, and the planets, down to Mercury. Since Mercury was formed, Ra ceased to generate any additional "offspring;" but, instead, slowly condensed to his present limits and became *Har*, or Horus, the new sun. In other words, he gave birth to a son, or successor, who became the ruling sun of the solar system. The

legends relating to Ra, his reign upon earth, his love for Isis (Venus), his being stung and poisoned by the serpent (*Set* or Typhon, Mercury), and his old age, decrepitude, and death, refer to these stages in the formation of the solar system.

When the Egyptians were no longer able to conceive of the earth as a planet revolving around the sun between Mars and Venus, they substituted *Chons*, the moon, for *Seb*, and thus involved themselves in countless inconsistencies and contradictions.

The sun, both as Ra and Horus, is always without a feminine consort, or counterpart. This is logical, for the sun, as the father and generator of the planetary system, and as the center and ruler of the solar system, is active and masculine, never passive, receptive, or feminine.

The planets, on the contrary, are alike active and passive, masculine and feminine. We accordingly find couples, such as *Shu* and *Tefnut*, *Seb* and *Nut*, *Osiris* and *Isis*, and *Seth* and *Nephthis*. In the Sothiac system the sun is supposed to ascend and descend through the six planetary stages or zones. The lowest zone is that between the sun and Mercury. Descending, it is governed by *Har-pa-chrat* (Messori); ascending, by *Thoth*; hence Mercury or Hermes. The next zone lies between Mercury and Venus. Descending, it is ruled by *Seth*, or Typhon, sometimes in his form of *Ap-ap*, or the "Giant Snake;" ascending, by *Api*, the Nile; hence "*Ap-ap-i*" and "*Pa-opi*."

The third zone, which lies between Venus and the Earth, is presided over, descending, by *Osiris*, "The

One," "The Perfect One," "The Ancient One," and, ascending, by Hathor, the "alter ego," or counterpart, of Isis. The corresponding months are *Pa-uon-i* and Athyr, or Hathor.

The fourth zone, which lies between the earth, or moon, and Mars, is presided over, descending, by *Chons*, the moon, and, ascending, by *Seb*, in his character of nourisher of planet-life, a position afterwards usurped by *Bastet*.

The fifth zone, or that between Mars and Jupiter, was sacred, descending, to *Shu*, the Agathodæmon of the Greeks, and, ascending, to *Tef-nut*, sometimes called *Tef-teb* and *Tef-necht*.

The sixth, or highest zone, lying between Jupiter and Saturn, was ruled over by Ra, the sun at the zenith. In the year, when the ascending, or growing, sun reached this zone, he was *em-hir*, that is, in his highest sign; and when he reached his crown (*cha-f*), or culminating point, or, as it was often expressed, his *ian*, or turning point, he was said to be *em-hat*, that is, "at the heart," or middle, of his annual course. These terms gave rise to the names *Emhir*, or Mechir, and *Pa-ra-m-hat*, or Phamenoth. The formation and government of the solar system; the birth, growth, and death of man; the birth, growth, and death of the day and year; and the government of the world by Pharaoh, the son and successor of Ra, are all explained in one way. The standard is God's government of the material universe, as illustrated by the formation and government of the solar system, and by the birth, life, and death of man.

The Sothiac year was modeled after the scientific, or *vague*, year. Originally it commenced when Sothis rose heliacally on the first day of Pharmuthi; the last occurrence of which, before the accession of Mena, was in the year 4864 B. C.

The Egyptians, according to Manetho, assigned 1,255 years to the government of the *Ach-i-u*, or "Saints," the last of whom was called Bytis, or *Buti*, the name afterwards used to designate the King of Lower Egypt. These 1,255 years before Mena did not reach back to the beginning of a Sothiac cycle. The chronology, however, was carried back 11,895 years further, or to the year 17394 B. C., so as to include certain astronomical periods allotted to the government of *Shu*, *Seb*, Osiris, Seth, and Horus.

It should be borne in mind that the sun did not become Ra, that is, a ruler in the Egyptian sense, until he had at least one planet revolving around and subject to him. This first planet was supposed to be Saturn, the father of Time. The original Ra, to whom Saturn was subject, was called the "son of Ptah" in Lower Egypt. At Thebes, the architect, or "modeler," of this Ra was called *Amen*; at Elephantinè, *Num*, or *Chnum*.

Thus, Ra, the "son of Ptah," sometimes called *Sa-neit*, "Son of Neith," and *Ptah*, *Amen*, and *Chnum*, together with their consorts, were all associated with the highest zone.

But Jupiter, the most magnificent of the planets, the central sun and ruler of a grand system of moons, or satellites, was also called Ra, and followed immedi-

ately after Ra, the "son of Ptah." The appearance of two "Ras in immediate succession confused the copyists of the list, who dropped the last, supposing it to be a repetition of the first; but "Helios, [son of] Hephaistos," in the present copy of Manetho's list, corrupt though it be, points to a planet Ra as well as the primeval sun Ra. The Pyramid Texts abound in allusions to the "Great Nine," generally called the "Great Ennead." When the inscriptions known as the "Pyramid Texts" were engraved in the chambers and passages of the pyramids of *Unas*, *Teta*, *Meri-ra*, *Pepa*, *Mer-en-ra Menthu-em-sa-uf*, and *Nofer-ka-ra Pepa*, the sun of the Sothiac year was below the horizon, hence Ra had become *Tum*. Now the "Great Nine" are enumerated as follows:

- |  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| 1. <i>Ra</i> , in his character of<br><i>Tum</i> . | 5. <i>Nut</i> , his consort. |
| 2. <i>Shu</i> .                                    | 6. Osiris.                   |
| 3. <i>Tef-nut</i> , his consort.                   | 7. Isis, his consort.        |
| 4. <i>Seb</i> .                                    | 8. Seth.                     |
|  | 9. Nephthis, his consort.    |

These, of course, were followed by Horus, the present sun. It is not without a good and sufficient reason that Ra is here fixed at the summer solstice, or the beginning of Phamenoth. The Turin papyrus furnishes the evidence that as far back as the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty the number of years each of these were supposed to have ruled was carefully set down, and it is a most significant fact that the reigns of all the kings prior to the Eighteenth Dynasty, beginning with *Mena*, "the head," were accurately given in years, months, and days.

---

It is amusing and instructive to see what shapes these primitive notions regarding the formation of the solar system assumed after they reached the Greeks and Romans. For example, Ovid, in the first book of his work, called the "Metamorphoses," says:

"At first the sea, the earth, and the heaven, which covers all things, were the only face of nature throughout the whole universe, which men have named Chaos; a rude and undigested mass, and nothing more than an inert weight and the discordant atoms of things not harmonizing, heaped together in the same spot. No sun as yet gave light to the world, nor did the moon, by increasing, recover her horns anew. The earth did not as yet hang in the surrounding air balanced by its own weight, nor had Amphitrite stretched out her arms along the lengthened margin of the coasts. Wherever, too, was the land, there also was the sea and the air; and thus was the earth without firmness, the sea unnavigable, the air void of light; in no one of them did its form exist. And one was obstructing the other, because in the same body the cold was striving with the hot, the moist with the dry, the soft with the hard, things having weight with those devoid of weight.

"To this discord God and bounteous nature put an end; for he separated the earth from the heavens, and the waters from the earth, and distinguished the clear heavens from the gross atmosphere. And after he unraveled these, and released them from the confused heap, he combined them, thus disjoined, in harmonious unison in place. The element of the vaulted heaven, fiery and without weight, shone forth, and selected a place for itself in the highest region:

next after it, in lightness and in place, was the air; the earth was more weighty than these, and drew with it the more ponderous atoms, and was pressed together by its own gravity.

“The encircling waters sank to the lowermost place and surrounded the solid globe. When thus he, whoever of the gods he was, had divided the mass so separated, and reduced it, so divided, into members, in the first place, that it might not be unequal on any side, he gathered it up into the form of a vast globe; then he commanded the sea to be poured around it. . . .

“He commanded the plains, too, to be extended, the valleys to sink down, the craggy mountains to arise. . . .

“Scarcely had he separated all these by fixed limits, when the stars, which had long lain hid, concealed between that mass, began to glow through the range of the heavens. . . .

“But an animated being, more holy than these, more fitted to receive higher faculties, and which could rule over the rest, was still wanting. Then *man* was formed. Whether it was that the Artificer of all things, the original of the world in its improved state, framed him from divine elements, or whether the earth, being newly made, and but lately divided from the lofty æther, still retained some atoms of its kindred heaven, which, tempered with the waters of the stream, the son of Iapetus (*Ia-pet*) fashioned after the image of the gods. . . . Thus, that which had been lately rude earth, and without any regular shape, being changed, assumed the form of Man.”

Now, picture to yourself the nebular, chaotic mass, extending to the limits of the solar system, out of

which the primeval sun, the planets, and the present sun were evolved, or formed, and every word of the above quotation will immediately become intelligible. Sea, earth, and air were heaped together in the same place, an inert, chaotic mass. As yet there was no sun, no moon, no earth. Land, sea, and air were mixed and combined in one confused mass. "The earth was without firmness," that is, the entire mass was still in a nebular state. The stars were obscured by this cloudy envelope, and it was not until the air, sea, and earth had been separated, etc., that they first shone forth.

The earth was gathered up in the form of a vast globe, and was suspended in space, balanced by its own weight. The "lifting up" of the equatorial mass, in the form of a ring, is omitted, but the process by which the collapsed ring gathered together in the form of a globe is described as the result of the attraction of gravitation. The earth was more weighty than the air and water, attracted the more ponderous atoms to it, and was pressed together by its own gravity. The law by which the "heat atoms," here called "the element of the vaulted heaven, fiery and without weight," were gradually "pressed out" of the more weighty mass, and forced to the highest regions, is obscurely hinted at. The Artificer, who divided the mass, and formed it into sun and planets, is not named, because he was *Ptah*; and Hephaistos, or Vulcan, would not answer the purpose, according to Roman notions. But when we come to the creation of Man,

the allusion to “the waters of the *stream*” (Nile) and “the son of Iapetus” (*Ia-pet*, “foreign *Ia*”), stamp the entire account as distinctly Egyptian.

Moses and Ovid both followed the ancient Egyptian account of the formation of the solar system and the creation of man, which has led many to suppose that Ovid copied from Moses. The Golden Age, in which man practiced faith and rectitude (*anch* and *maat*) of his own accord, without any avenger and without laws, and in which punishment, and the fear of it, did not exist, etc., is exclusively Egyptian—the glorious age of the *Achiu*, Manes, or “Saints,” the “Ancient of Days,” when there were no human rulers, when the “people of the saints” recognized no ruler but God alone.

### PRESENT STATE OF EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY

The present state of Egyptian chronology, the divergent and conflicting views upon the subject which have been published to the world by eminent Egyptologists, and the hopeless confusion and obscurity in which it seems to be still enveloped, are well expressed in the following extract from the excellent “History” of Rawlinson:

“It is a patent fact, and one that is beginning to obtain general recognition, that the chronological element in the early Egyptian history is in a state of almost hopeless obscurity. Modern critics of the best judgment and the widest knowledge, basing their con-

clusions on identically the same data, have published to the world views upon the subject which are not only divergent and conflicting, but which differ in the estimates that are the most extreme, to the extent of above three thousand years. . . . The Egyptians had no era. They drew out no chronological schemes. They cared for nothing but to know how long each incarnate god, human or bovine, had condescended to tarry upon the earth. They recorded carefully the length of the life of each Apis-bull, and the length of the reign of each king; but they neglected to take note of the intervals between one Apis-bull and another, and omitted to distinguish the sole reign of a monarch from his joint-reign with others. A monarch might occupy the throne ten years in conjunction with his father, thirty-two years alone, and three years in conjunction with his son—in an Egyptian royal list, he will be credited with forty-five years, although his first ten years will be assigned also to his father, and his last three to his son. Contemporary dynasties, if accepted as legitimate, will appear in an Egyptian list as consecutive, while dynasties not so accepted, however long they may have reigned, will disappear altogether. . . .

“Generally speaking, the Egyptian monumental lists are not chronological at all; the only one which is so, the Turin papyrus, exists in tattered fragments, the original order of which is uncertain, while the notices of time, which it once contained, are, in many cases, lost or obliterated. . . . It may be added that the chronological element is altogether wanting in the earlier part of the papyrus, while, as the papyrus itself belongs to the time of the Eighteenth Dynasty, it furnishes no materials at all, either for the chronology or the history of the later kingdom. These many and great defects of the Turin papyrus . . .

quite impossible to supply from any other monumental source. Occasional correction of the numbers given in the papyrus may be made from the annals of the kings; but there is no possibility of filling up its gaps from the monuments, nor of constructing from them alone anything like a consecutive chronological scheme, either for the Early, the Middle, or even the Later Empire. The Middle Empire—that of the Hyksos—left no monuments at all; and from the monuments alone no estimate of its duration can be formed. The Early and the Later Empires left important monuments; but not a continuous series of them; and the result is that, even for the last, a monumental chronology is absolutely unattainable.”

The foregoing extract is a fair sample of the manner in which the subject of Egyptian chronology has been viewed, studied, and treated.

In speaking of Manetho, Rawlinson says he wrote for the information of the Greeks, then recently settled in Egypt as the dominant race, a history of his country, which was confessedly complete, and, in a certain sense, continuous, and which contained a vast number of chronological statements, though nothing like a definite chronology, adding:

“Manetho’s work was not so much a history of Egypt as a history of the Egyptian kings, whom he divided into thirty dynasties, which he treated of separately, apparently without distinctly marking whether they were contemporaneous or consecutive. Against each king’s name was set the number of years that he reigned; and at the close of each account of a dynasty these years were

added together and the total sum given. The imperfection of the method was twofold. Joint-reigns were counted as if they had been successive in the summation of the years of a dynasty; and contemporary dynasties not being in many cases distinctly marked, the sum total of all the years of the dynasties was greatly in excess of the real period during which the monarchy had lasted. . . .

“Finally, it has to be borne in mind that Manetho’s chronological statements, even when fully ascertained by the agreement of all the epitomes, are not unfrequently contradicted by the monuments, and, consequently, rejected by all modern critics. This occurs even in the later part of the history, where the dates are, as nearly as possible, certain. If Manetho could make mistakes with respect to the reigns of kings who were removed from his time by no more than three centuries, how can he be implicitly trusted with respect to reigns at least twenty centuries earlier?”

Such opinions as these are based upon careless, superficial, and unscientific examinations of the badly corrupted lists, which were originally extracted from Manetho’s History by some unknown Jewish, or Christian, author, and afterwards copied and transmitted by Josephus, Africanus, Eusebius, and others. Manetho is not responsible for the errors to be found in the present lists, for, as we shall see, many of them antedate Josephus, whose partial list is the earliest we possess.

Brugsch, one of the most distinguished Egyptologists, after calling attention to the difference of

2,079 years between the highest and lowest estimate of the date of the accession of Mena, "the first king of Egypt," adds: "Instead of growing less, the difficulties in determining the chronological relations of Egyptian history are on the contrary multiplied from day to day; for new problems, the solution of which has still to be waited for, are continually presenting themselves in the province of investigations about chronology."

After trying to show that in the Turin papyrus the joint-reigns of the kings of the Twelfth Dynasty were counted twice, which I shall show is an error, he expresses himself as follows: "From this particular case the reader will be able to form some idea of the kind of difficulties with which science has to contend at every step in order to compose a perfect picture of the succession and dates of the old Egyptian reigns. . . . This old usage places such difficulties and doubts in the way of researches thousands of years after the events as to drive one to downright despair of putting together a consistent historical chronology of the Egyptian Kingdom." I may add that Brugsch, discarding all known chronological systems, bases his own chronology entirely on the supposed sequence of generations, estimating three generations to a century. I am far from wishing to criticise the men of science who have unlocked the sealed book of ancient Egypt, and founded the science of modern Egyptology. Beginning with Champollion and Lepsius, and coming on down to Brugsch and Maspero, I regard them all with feelings of profound admiration and gratitude,

and know that their work will endure as one of the most brilliant achievements of the human intellect; but the science is necessarily progressive, for the history and chronology of a period covering nearly four thousand years, is so complicated and involved, that it is a physical impossibility to master all the manifold details within the brief span of a few years. That which has been accomplished in this field during the latter half of this century is all-sufficient to fill us with wonder and amazement.

### “THE SOTHIAIC YEAR”

We are told that the ancient Egyptians were altogether ignorant of the science of chronology, had no era, and, in fact, cared nothing for the chronological element in history.

The fragments of the Turin papyrus, however, a document which was drawn up about the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty, although the present copy dates, most probably, from the reign of Seti I, show conclusively that the reigns of the kings of Egypt, from *Mena*, “the first king,” to Apophis II, the last king of the Seventeenth, or Hyksos, Dynasty, were carefully registered in years, months, and days, so that one very essential element of chronology, at least, was certainly at hand from the beginning of the kingdom.

But we expect to show that the *basis* of the chronological system of the ancient Egyptians was purely and strictly astronomical, and that the separate reigns, although accurate enough in themselves when placed

together successively, were adjusted to the absolute astronomical eras and epochs.

It is true that the regnal years of the Pharaohs were used in dating writings and inscriptions; but this, of itself, was not inconsistent with an accurate chronological system.

The same style prevails with regard to Acts of Parliament, etc., in England, where the Christian Era is in general use.

The "risings" of the stars were carefully observed and registered in Egypt from the earliest times, notably the "Heliacal Rising of Sothis," or Sirius, which was celebrated as the Festival of the New Year.

It was well known to the classical writers that the Egyptians were the first to cultivate the science of astronomy, to observe the risings of the stars and the eclipses of the sun and moon, and to register and preserve those observations in their temples. Aristotle tells us that the Egyptians *preceded* the Babylonians in the cultivation of this science.

It is a most significant fact that the astronomical observations of the Babylonians, sent to Aristotle by Callisthenes, extended back 1,903 years only from the date of the conquest of Babylonia by Alexander, or, in other words, from 331 B. C. to 2234 B. C. We shall see that the foundation of the Kingdom of Babylon by Nimrod, the "son of Cush," took place *after* the Hamite Conquest of Egypt, or 2348 B. C. A local 'Aamu, or Hamite, Government, was established in Egypt about one hundred years before this date, and it was by these, and not by the invaders, that the

Babylonian Kingdom was founded. I am convinced that the date 2234 B. C., when the astronomical observations in Babylonia began, marks the beginning of the Babylonian Kingdom. Before this date there was no kingdom on the Egyptian model in Babylonia and Mesopotamia. Now, as the astronomical observations in Babylonia do not extend back farther than 2234 B. C., it will be seen that astronomy was cultivated in Egypt at least two thousand years before it was carried to Babylonia by the Cushite Nimrod.

Long before the ancient Empire of Egypt was founded by *Mena*, the Egyptians, as we have seen, had determined the length of the year, and had divided it into twelve months of thirty days each, to the last of which five extra, or intercalary, days were added. This year of three hundred and sixty-five days was the ordinary, or *vague*, year, and was used in the ordinary transactions of life, in the dating of inscriptions, and, perhaps, in fixing some of the monthly festivals. The months were divided into three weeks of ten days each. Besides the *vague* year, the Egyptians had a sacred year of three hundred and sixty-five and one-fourth days, the beginning of which was determined by the "risings" of the fixed stars, the sun's position in the heavens, etc. Diodorus mentions this sacred year of three hundred and sixty-five and one-fourth days in the following passage:

"The Thebans boast that they were the most ancient philosophers and astronomers of any people in the world—the situation of their country being such

as gave them an advantage over others in clearly discerning the rising and setting of the stars; that the months and years are most properly ordered and disposed by them, for they measure their days according to the motion of the sun, and not of the moon, and account thirty days to every month, and add five and one-fourth days to every twelve months, and by this means they complete the whole year. . . . But these of Thebes seem most accurately to have observed the eclipses of the sun and moon."

The ordinary, or vague, year of three hundred and sixty-five days, in common use among the Egyptians from the earliest times, was nearly a quarter of a day short, so that the "Rising of Sothis," and the fixed year also, advanced one day every four years. In other words, the years, seasons, and months of the ordinary, or vague, year receded one day in four years. We remedy this discrepancy by intercalating one day each fourth, or leap, year. If we should cease to do this, our years and months would likewise *recede* one day in each four years, one month in each one hundred and twenty years, and one complete year in each fourteen hundred and sixty years. This can be verified by a simple calculation, for, if the year would recede one day in four years, it would necessarily recede three hundred and sixty-five days in  $(365 \times 4)$  fourteen hundred and sixty years.

The failure of the ancient Egyptians to intercalate this additional day at the end of each four years, caused the "Rising of Sothis" to advance one full month of thirty days in one hundred and twenty years, one full season of four months in four hundred and

eighty years, and one full year, including the five intercalatory days, in fourteen hundred and sixty years, or fourteen hundred and sixty-one vague years. This year of fourteen hundred and sixty-one vague years was called the "Great Year," or "Sothiac Year," and these months of one hundred and twenty years were called Hantis, or Sothiac months. The Sothiac months bore the same names as the ordinary months, and were sacred to the same so-called deities. The reigning Pharaoh, the successor of Horus on the throne of Upper and Lower Egypt, was identified with Ra, or the sun, and supposed to occupy the same position in the Sothiac year.

When the "Heliacal Rising of Sothis" took place on the first day of the first month of the year, called Thoth, a new Sothiac year commenced. The Pharaoh who happened to sit on the throne at the beginning of a new Sothiac year, was considered to be exceptionally fortunate. He was termed "*nem-mestu*," "re-born," or "*nem-chau*," "re-crowned." It seems that these Sothiac eras were named in honor of the Pharaoh who happened to reign at the time. The classical writers mention the "Era of Menophres," which was the Horus-title of a King Ramesses, who reigned at the beginning of the era 1324 B. C. Menophres is the Greek form of *Mer-nu-ph'ra*, meaning "Beloved by the Sun." The Sothiac era 4244 B. C., as we shall see, marks the reign of *Mena*, the first king of Egypt, and the Sothiac era 2784 B. C. fell in the reign of Amenemes I.

The coincidence of the era was carefully noted.

Thus *Mena* reigned sixty-two years after the era 4244 B. C., *Amen-em-het I* reigned sixteen years before and thirteen years after, the era 2784 B. C., and *Ramesses Mer-nu-ph'ra* reigned seven years before, and twenty-nine years after, the era 1324 B. C. In fact, the official registers showed how many years, months, and days each of these kings reigned before, and after, these eras, but, unfortunately, the years only have come down to us.

In the same way, the king who happened to reign at the beginning of a new Sothiac month, or *hanti*, of one hundred and twenty years, was distinguished as an "epoch-king," and received an epoch-title, to mark him as such.

Before we go into particulars, however, it will be necessary to say a few words about Manetho, the native Egyptian priest who published a History of Egypt, in three books, at the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, or about 287 B. C.

### MANETHO THE HISTORIAN

Manetho was a native Egyptian priest, and, as such, learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. He is called a "Priest of Sebennytus," a city located near the center of the Delta. It seems that he lived at the court of Ptolemy Soter. It will be seen from my restoration of his chronological scheme, that he carried his chronology down to the year 287 B. C., which was the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. It is evident, from this fact, that he published his History of Egypt under the last-named Pha-

raoh, and, as I assume, at the direction of his royal patron. He divided his history into three books, assigning the first eleven dynasties to his first book, the Twelfth to the Nineteenth Dynasties, both inclusive, to his second book, and the Twentieth to the Thirtieth Dynasties, both inclusive, to his third book. We shall see that he had good *chronological* reasons for this division of his dynasties, that the beginning of the Twelfth and Twentieth Dynasties coincides with the beginning of Sothiac eras, and that the throne did not pass to a new family at either of these times.

Josephus says: "Manetho was a man who was by birth an Egyptian, yet he had made himself master of the Greek learning, as is very evident; for he wrote the history of his own country in the Greek tongue, by translating it, as he saith himself, out of their sacred records."

In another place, Josephus says: "Manetho promised to interpret the Egyptian history out of their sacred writings."

These allusions to Manetho and his work are as important as they are meager, because they demonstrate that the history which he translated into Greek, existed as part of the sacred records, or sacred writings, of the Egyptians, and that he merely translated, or interpreted, it into Greek.

Eusebius testifies that Manetho, the Egyptian, not only reduced the entire history of Egypt into a Greek form, but also their whole system of theology.

Plutarch, in his treatise on Isis and Osiris, had oc-

casion to mention Manetho several times, and, in one place, as living under Ptolemy Soter.

Bunsen considers him "the most distinguished historian, sage, and scholar of Egypt—the man whom all our ancient authorities mention with respect."

In his treatise against Apion, Josephus professes to quote several entire passages from Manetho's Egyptian History, although we shall see that what Josephus calls a *verbatim* quotation is nothing more than an extract or running commentary.

Ælian styles Manetho "The Historian endowed with consummate wisdom."

The discoveries now published in this work, however, will serve to restore Manetho to his proper rank as an historian, and to demonstrate how accurate, truthful, and scientific his work must have been. When we contrast him with the Greek historians of his time, and consider that his chronological system, before it was corrupted by those who attempted to copy from it, was as accurate as the "Canon of Ptolemy," our admiration for him will be proportionately increased.

It has been assumed that the early records, monuments, inscriptions, annals, and literature generally, of the Egyptians, were entirely destroyed by the Hyksos during their invasion and occupation of Egypt; but this assumption is not supported by the facts. Although the Hyksos may have destroyed much in the Delta, the destruction was not of that general and complete nature imagined. When Herodotus visited Egypt about 450 B. C., and when Manetho published

his History of Egypt, about 287 B. C., monuments, monumental inscriptions, temple registers, annals, and historical records, reaching back to the earliest kings, and papyri containing literary, scientific, and sacred literature of all kinds, were plentiful throughout Egypt. Regarding this literature, we shall have many occasions to comment upon the simple, direct, and truthful way in which the Egyptians observed and described everything which came within their notice. This way of seeing, speaking, and writing qualified them admirably for the sober and important work of recording and transmitting truthful accounts of historical events. In this respect they were the exact opposite of the Greeks, whose enthusiasm, wild imagination, and love of the marvelous, almost unfitted them for this task. It is for this reason that the works of the Greeks have proved to be of so little assistance in the field of ancient Egyptian history. Even Herodotus himself, the so-called "Father of History," again and again leaves the path of historical facts to regale us with fables and marvelous stories. Manetho not only *professed* to write his history from the monuments and sacred records, but he actually *did* so. Wherever the fragments of his work can be compared with existing monuments and inscriptions, we find that they agree with, and were originally taken from, such monuments and inscriptions. The lists and numbers extracted from his work have suffered much at the hands of the early chronographers (who attempted to adjust them to certain artificial chronological schemes derived from Josephus) and careless copyists.

Certain dynastic lists extracted from Manetho's work have come down to us in the "Chronocon" of Eusebius and the "Chronographia" of Georgius Syncellus.

In addition to these lists, we possess lists of the Hyksos Dynasty, the Eighteenth Dynasty, and the first two kings of the Nineteenth Dynasty, extracted by Josephus from Manetho's History; a partial and somewhat corrupt list of the Eighteenth Dynasty, copied by Theophilus, presumably from Africanus; and an artificial and fraudulent list of separate reigns and epoch-reigns known as the "Pseudo-Sothis List" of Syncellus, many of which may have been taken from Manetho's "Book of Sothis."

I think there can be no doubt that Manetho published a work on the Chronology of Ancient Egypt, based on the Sothiac eras and epochs, called the "Book of Sothis." This work, covering nearly four thousand years of history, could not, by any possible means, be compressed within the limits of the post-diluvian chronological schemes of the early Christian chronographers, and was, therefore, soon lost or destroyed, and a false work, bearing the same title and also ascribed to Manetho, was fraudulently substituted for it. The fragments of the Turin papyrus, the Manethonian Lists themselves, and the List of Eratosthenes, all show that the reigns of the Pharaohs were adapted to the Sothiac epochs, which served as absolute chronological points.

Wherever we can clear up the errors and detect the changes in the lists, Manetho is sustained and

borne out by the monuments which have survived to our times. Much has been written about "joint-reigns" and about Manetho's failure to properly apportion them, but this rests wholly upon erroneous assumptions. It will be demonstrated that Manetho invariably extracted the true chronology from the joint-reigns, and no instance can be found in the lists where he has given a joint-reign to both father and son. To single out a few prominent examples: Amenemes I reigned sixteen years *before* the era 2784 B. C., and thirteen years *after* it, that is, twenty-nine years altogether. These thirteen years include his joint-reign of about nine years with his son Usertasen I, who reigned altogether (that is, jointly with his father, alone, and jointly with his son) forty-five years. In other words, Usertasen I reigned jointly with his father about nine years, alone about thirty-three years, and jointly with his son, Amenemes II, about three years. Manetho gave Usertasen I the entire thirteen years of his father's reign *after* the cycle 2784 B. C., and the thirty-three years of his *sole* reign, to wit, forty-six years. Amenemes II has thirty-eight years, to wit, the three years of his joint-reign with Usertasen I and the thirty-five years of his sole reign. In the Pseudo-Sothis List, Usertasen I, there called Sesonchosis, has forty-nine years, and Amenemes II thirty-five years. Ramesses I, after reigning one year and four months alone, associated his son, Seti I, on the throne with him. After the death of Ramesses I, Seti I reigned many years alone, and then jointly with his son Ramesses II. Manetho apportioned these

joint-reigns as follows: Ramesses I, one year and four months, his sole reign; Seti I, fifty-nine years, his joint-reign with Ramesses I, his sole reign and his joint-reign with Ramesses II, and Ramesses II sixty-six years and two months, his sole reign, after the death of Seti I, and his joint-reign with Menophthah. It is manifest, from these examples, that Manetho understood how to apportion the joint-reigns so as to make his lists strictly chronological.

The Sothiac eras and epochs, upon which the ancient Egyptians based their chronology, registered themselves with unerring precision. We have just seen that the vague year of three hundred and sixty-five days, lacking, as it did, about six hours of being complete, dropped back, or receded, one day at the close of each four years, one month in one hundred and twenty years, one season of four months in four hundred and eighty years, and one entire year in one thousand four hundred and sixty-one years. The vague year, therefore, could be compared to a great astronomical clock, the hour-hand of which performed one complete revolution in fourteen hundred and sixty-one vague years. The Sothiac year was necessarily a great automatic, self-registering, chronological timepiece. Additional certainty, if required, could be obtained by observing the "risings" of the fixed stars, notably that of Sirius, the brightest and most familiar of them all. When Sirius rose just before the sun on the first day of a month, at the ancient capital, Heliopolis, which was selected as the mean point of observation, every Egyptian knew that a new

Sothiac month had commenced, and that one hundred and twenty years had rolled by since Sirius had risen "heliacally" on the first day of the preceding month. The system was both simple and accurate, and, as the entire nation helped to keep count of the days, months, and years, no mistake could possibly be made. A calculation based upon the number of years which were known to have elapsed since a given event, compared with the number of years during which successive Pharaohs were known to have reigned, could be tested at any time by observing the sun's position with respect to Sothis and other fixed stars. Under such a system mistakes were impossible. We find just the reverse of what modern Egyptologists have assumed. It is not true that the ancient Egyptians were ignorant of the science of chronology. On the contrary, by converting their year into a great, self-registering, astronomical clock, they provided for themselves a most accurate chronological system, although they were put to the inconvenience of seeing their year slowly revolve through all the seasons within the period of fourteen hundred and sixty-one years.

According to the Christian era, as now established, the first day of Messori of the third historical cycle coincided with the year 4 B. C., and the first day of Thoth, or the beginning of the fourth historical cycle, with the year 136 A. D.; but there can be no doubt that the birth of Christ coincided with the beginning of the month of Messori, and that an error of four years was made in fixing our era. This ex-

plains why we have used the years 4244 B. C., 2784 B. C., and 1324 B. C., for the Sothiac eras, instead of 4240 B. C., 2780 B. C., and 1320 B. C.

The rising of Sothis takes place in the latitude of Heliopolis about July 19-20. Now, as Sothis rose on the first day of Messori at the beginning of our era, and on the first day of Thoth about 136 A. D., he again rose on the first day of Thoth in the year 1596 (1600) A. D., on the first day of Paophi in the year 1716 (1720) A. D., and on the first day of Athyr in the year 1836 (1840) A. D. The rising of Sothis on July 19-20, 1896 (1900), therefore, coincided with the sixteenth day of Athyr, which is equivalent to  $140 + 1460 + 120 + 120 + 60 = 1900$ . We have, therefore, reached the year 1900 A. D., according to the correct astronomical reckoning, although we write it 1896.

### **THE CHRONOLOGICAL NUMBERS OF JOSEPHUS**

The chronological scheme incidentally laid down by Josephus in his great work entitled "The Antiquities of the Jews," was received with such unbounded faith by the early Christian chronographers, and for this reason had such an injurious effect upon the Manethonian Lists, that it will be necessary to examine it briefly.

The passages containing the most important chronological statements are the following:

"Solomon began to build his temple in the fourth year of his reign, in the second month, which the Macedonians call Artemisius and the Hebrews Jur;

five hundred and ninety-two years after the Exodus out of Egypt, but one thousand and twenty years from Abraham's coming out of Mesopotamia into Canaan; and after the Deluge one thousand four hundred and forty years; and from Adam, the first man who was created, until Solomon built the temple, there had passed in all three thousand one hundred and two years. Now, that year upon which the temple began to be built was already the eleventh year of the reign of Hiram; but from the building of Tyre to the building of the temple, there had passed two hundred and forty years." (Book 8, Ch. 3, Par. 1.)

"So the ten tribes of the Israelites were removed out of Judea nine hundred and forty-seven years after their forefathers were come out of the land of Egypt, and possessed themselves of this country, but eight hundred years after Joshua had been their leader, and, as I have already observed, two hundred and forty years, seven months, and seven days after they had revolted from Rehoboam, the grandson of David, and had given the kingdom to Jeroboam." (Book 9, Ch. 14, Par. 1.)

"And after this manner have the kings of David's race ended their lives, being in number twenty-one, until the last king, who altogether reigned five hundred and fourteen years, and six months, and ten days: of whom Saul, who was their first king, retained the government twenty years, though he was not of the same tribe as the rest." (Book 10, Ch. 8, Par. 4.)

"Now the temple was burnt four hundred and seventy years, six months, and ten days after it was built. It was then one thousand and sixty-two years, six months, and ten days from the departure out of Egypt; and from the Deluge to the destruction of the temple the whole interval was one thousand nine

hundred and fifty-seven years, six months, and ten days; but from the generation of Adam until this befell the temple there were three thousand five hundred and thirteen years, six months, and ten days: so great was the number of years hereto belonging; and what actions were done during these years we have particularly related." (Book 10, Ch. 8, Par. 5.)

"But the entire interval of time which passed from the captivity of the Israelites to the carrying away of the two tribes proved to be one hundred and thirty years, six months, and ten days." (Book 10, Ch. 9, Par. 7.)

In Chapter 10, Book 20, speaking of the high priests, of whom there were thirteen before the building of the temple, Josephus says:

"Now the number of years during the rule of these thirteen, from the day when our fathers departed out of Egypt, under Moses their leader, until the building of that temple which King Solomon erected at Jerusalem, were six hundred and twelve. After those thirteen high priests, eighteen took the high priesthood at Jerusalem, one in succession to another, from the days of King Solomon until Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, made an expedition against that city, and burnt the temple, and removed our nation into Babylon, and then took Josadek, the high priest, captive; the times of these high priests were four hundred and sixty-six years, six months, and ten days, while the Jews were still under the regal government."

In his treatise against Apion, after vainly attempting to show that the Expulsion of the Hyksos, described by Manetho, was the Exodus of the Hebrews, described by Moses, Josephus again says that Solo-

mon built that temple six hundred and twelve years after the Jews came out of Egypt.

The destruction of Jerusalem in the eighteenth year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar and the eleventh year of the reign of Zedekiah affords us an astronomically-fixed point from which the above-mentioned numbers can be applied and tested. We know from the "Canon of Ptolemy" and other sources, that the reign of Nebuchadnezzar commenced in the year 604 B. C. The date, 586 B. C., now generally adopted for the Destruction of Jerusalem, is approximately correct. As the temple was burnt four hundred and seventy years after it was built, according to Josephus, we have 1056 B. C. as his date for the building of the temple, about the same date required by the four hundred and sixty-six years, six months, and ten days of the high priests. Taking his one thousand and sixty-two years from the Exodus to the destruction of Jerusalem, we find that his date for the Exodus was 1648 B. C. Of course, the six hundred and twelve years between the Exodus and the building of the temple would carry us back to 1668 B. C.

The interval of 1,957 years between the Deluge and the destruction of the temple gives us 2543 B. C. as the date of the Deluge. In like manner, 3,513 years from the generation of Adam fixed his beginning point at 4099 B. C.

We have demonstrated in this work that the capture of Samaria by Shalmanesar could not have occurred later than the year 721 B. C. The sum of one hundred and thirty years, six months, and ten

days, therefore, for the entire interval between this event and the carrying away of the two tribes should be one hundred and thirty-six years, six months, and ten days. It is evident that the six of the months following immediately after the six of the years has led to the omission of the first six. There were about one hundred and thirty-six years, six months, and ten days between 721 B. C. and 586 B. C. Now beginning at the fixed date, 721 B. C., nine hundred and forty-seven years take us back to 1668 B. C. as the date of the Exodus, which is equivalent to six hundred and twelve years, instead of five hundred and ninety-two years, between the Exodus and the building of the temple; two hundred and forty-seven years, however, to the capture of Jerusalem by Shishak would place this event at 968 B. C., which is about nineteen years short of the actual date. I think this is also owing to an error of some copyist. The fact that 247 follows immediately after 947 in Josephus indicates that the latter 47 is merely a repetition of the preceding 47, and that Josephus originally had two hundred and sixty-seven years, six months, etc., which would place the capture of Jerusalem by Shishak at 988 B. C. This is rendered probable by a mistake made by Josephus himself. He says: "So Solomon died when he was already an old man, having reigned eighty years, and lived ninety-four." As the Bible fixes Solomon's reign at forty years, there is an error of at least forty years here. Having placed the beginning of Solomon's reign at  $(1056+3)$  1059 B. C., Josephus must have fixed his death at about (1059—

80) 979 B. C., which makes the interval between the capture of Jerusalem and the carrying away of the ten tribes two hundred and fifty-eight, instead of two hundred and forty-seven years.

The numbers from the building of the temple vary somewhat from those already given. The five hundred and ninety-two years to the Exodus agree with the date 1648 B. C., but the 1,440 years to the Deluge give us 2496 B. C., instead of 2543 B. C., while 3,102 years to the generation of Adam give us 4158 B. C., instead of 4099 B. C. These small discrepancies are probably owing to errors in the present text. The errors committed by Josephus himself are apparent, and can be easily explained; but it would lead us beyond the scope of this work to attempt it here. We simply wish to restore the chronology of Josephus as he had it, so as to show how it subsequently affected the Manethonian Lists.

The duration of the Jewish Kingdom is placed at five hundred and fourteen years, which reaches back from 586 B. C. to 1100 B. C., and would place the building of the temple forty-four years only after the accession of Saul. As Saul, according to Josephus, reigned twenty years and David forty years, there would be a slight discrepancy here.

The principal dates of Josephus seem to be the following:

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Birth of Adam, . . . . .                              | 4158 B. C. |
| Exodus, . . . . .                                     | 1648 B. C. |
| Building of the Temple, . . . . .                     | 1056 B. C. |
| Capture of Jerusalem by Shishak, . . . . .            | 988 B. C.  |
| Capture of Samaria by Shalmanesar, . . . . .          | 721 B. C.  |
| Destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, . . . . . | 586 B. C.  |

Clemens of Alexandria, who could, with proper investigation, have easily ascertained the true astronomical dates from Manetho's History and other equally reliable sources, chose to blindly follow Josephus, and to adopt his highest date, 1668 B. C., for the Exodus. By a simple computation he ascertained this to be three hundred and forty-five years before the beginning of the Sothiac Era, 1324 B. C. When he says that the Exodus occurred three hundred and forty-five years before the Sothiac Era, he, therefore, simply means that the highest date fixed by Josephus for this event was three hundred and forty-five years before this era.

Africanus himself seems to have placed the Expulsion of the Hyksos and the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty at the correct dates, uninfluenced by the false theory of Josephus; but subsequent redactors of his lists have evidently attempted to change them so as to place the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty at 1648 B. C., and Thuoris, or King Nile, at 1181 B. C., as we have shown in another chapter of this work.

Although Eusebius fell into the error of placing Thuoris at 1181 B. C., he nevertheless placed the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty at 1723 B. C., and the Exodus under Achenaten.

The strangest fact, however, connected with this chronology and the attempt of Josephus to convert the Expulsion of the Hyksos into the Exodus, is that modern Egyptologists still cling to the date 1648 B. C. for the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty,

although they are well aware that the expulsion of the Hyksos had no connection with the Exodus.

### MANETHO'S GENERAL CHRONOLOGICAL SCHEME

According to Eusebius, Manetho assigned 13,900 years to the "gods" and "heroes." He tells us that "primus Ægyptiorum deus Vulcanus fuit, qui etiam ignis repertor apud eos celebratur. Ex eo Sol: postea Agathodæmon: deinde Saturnus: tum Osiris: exin Osiridis frater Typhon: ad extremum Orus, Osiridis et Isidis filius. Hi primi inter Ægyptios rerum potiti sunt. Deinceps continuata successione delapsa est regia auctoritas usque ad Bytin per annos tredecim mille ac nongentos."

This total of 13,900 years is the sum, in round numbers, of 11,985 years assigned to the "gods," and 1,855 years assigned to the "heroes," which items, however, were originally 11,895 and 1,255. Eusebius, after expressing the opinion that these so-called years were in reality *months*, adds:

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Post deos regnare heroes annis, . . . . .           | 1255 |
| Rursusque alii reges dominati sunt annis, . . . . . | 1817 |
| Tum alii triginta reges Memphitæ annis, . . . . .   | 1790 |
| Deinde alii Thinitæ decem reges annis, . . . . .    | 350  |
| Secuta est manium heroumque dominatio annis, . . .  | 5813 |
| Summa temporum in 11000 consurgit annorum.          |      |

It is evident, at first view, that these items no longer appear in their original order; "Other Kings" now *precede* the "Memphite Kings" and "Thinite Kings," while "Manes and Heroes" *follow after* the human kings.

The correct succession was as follows:

|  |              |       |
|--|--------------|-------|
| Dominion of the gods, Ptah, etc., . . . . .            | 11,895 years |       |
| Heroes, or manes ( <i>achiu</i> , "saints"), . . . . . | 1,255        | "     |
|  |              | <hr/> |
| Total (9 Sothiac cycles), . . . . .                    | 13,149       | "     |
| "Ten Thinite kings," . . . . .                         | 350          | "     |
| (?) "Memphite kings," . . . . .                        | 1,797        | "     |
| "Other kings," . . . . .                               | 1,810        | "     |

The first historical cycle commenced 4244 B. C., and the 1,255 years of the "manes," or heroes, *end* at this date. The last item, "manes *and* heroes," is an absurdity upon its face. The sum, 5,813 years, is made up of the following items:

|   |             |       |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Heroes, . . . . .                                 | 1,855 years |       |
| Thinite kings, . . . . .                          | 350         | "     |
| Memphite kings, . . . . .                         | 1,797       | "     |
| Other kings, . . . . .                            | 1,810       | "     |
|   |             | <hr/> |
| Total of <i>heroes</i> and <i>men</i> , . . . . . | 5,813       | "     |

Here, as in other parts of his extracts from Manetho, Eusebius mixes separate items, sub-totals and grand totals together in hopeless confusion. It is almost as if the items had been written on separate slips of paper, placed in an urn and thoroughly mixed, and then drawn out blindfolded.

In transcribing the transposed items, 1,797 and 1,810, they were changed to 1,817 and 1,790.

The actual sub-totals, therefore, were:

|                           |              |       |
|---------------------------|--------------|-------|
| Gods and manes, . . . . . | 13,149 years |       |
| Human kings, . . . . .    | 3,957        | "     |
|                           |              | <hr/> |
| Grand total, . . . . .    | 17,106       | "     |

Eusebius obtained his round number 13,900 by adding 11,985 and 1,855, and his round number

11,000 by adding 1,255, 350, 1,790, 1,817, and 5,813. His grand total of 24,900 years, therefore, is the sum of 13,900 and 11,000.

"Sed revera dominatio, quam narrant Ægyptii, deorum, heroum et manium tenuisse putatur lunares annos omnino viginti quatuor mille et nongentos, ex quibus fiunt solares anni 2206."

As Eusebius had effectually disposed of Manetho's troublesome chronology by reducing his Egyptian years to lunar months, he was not very particular about copying the items.

The Egyptian priests informed Herodotus, about 450 B. C., that "it was 17,000 years before the reign of Amasis, when the number of their gods was increased from eight to twelve." (Hist. II, 43.) Now, as 17,000 is a round number, and the 17,106 years extend down to 287 B. C., the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the two estimates seem to be one and the same. The Sothiac cycles of the gods and heroes ( $11,895 + 1,255 = 13,149$ ) came to a close at the Sothiac Era. 4244 B. C., the adopted date of the beginning of the kingdom in Egypt. This date is verified and sustained by all the following dates, checked by the totals, epochs, and separate reigns:

Era of Mena, beginning of first historical cycle, 4244 B. C.

"Ten Thinite kings," . . . . . 350

Beginning of first Memphite Dynasty, . . 3894 B. C.

(?) "Memphite kings," . . . . . 1797

Beginning of Hyksos Dynasty, . . . . . 2097 B. C.

"Other kings," . . . . . 1810

Ptolemy Philadelphus, . . . . . 287 B. C.

Each of the above dates marks a turning point in Egyptian history: 4244 B. C., the establishment of the Kingdom by Mena; 3894 B. C., the beginning of the first Memphite Dynasty; 2097 B. C., the beginning of the great '*Aamu* or Hyksos Dynasty; and 287 B. C., the accession of Ptolemy Philadelphus, under whom Manetho published his history.

The date 3894 B. C. is verified by the much discussed but little understood total of 3,555 years to the end of the second Nectanebos' reign, that is, to 339 B. C.

The 1,255 years of the "manes" (*Achiiu* or "saints") extend back from 4244 B. C. to 5500 B. C., the date fixed on by Africanus and other early Christian chronographers for the Birth of Adam. In the course of time some one changed 1,255 to 1,855, and 11,895 to 11,985. In addition to this, the separate items were transposed and confused, so that they became almost unintelligible upon their face. Although Eusebius has 1,255 instead of 1,855 years for the manes or heroes, the total, 5,813, which is the sum of 1,855, 350, 1,797, and 1,810, shows that it also appeared as 1,855. The language itself, "*Secuta est manium heroumque dominatio annis 5813,*" indicates that it was the total of "manes," *or* heroes, and human kings, for "manes *and* heroes" are synonymous terms. It is manifest that Manetho could not have been guilty of such a stupid combination as "manium heroumque." We are not interested in the first period of 11,895 years, during which the sun and planets were supposed to have ruled over Egypt. Our remarks on

the ancient Egyptian theory of the formation of the solar system will suffice on this subject. We have no reason to suppose, however, that the 1,255 years assigned to the dominion of the "manes," *achiu*, or "saints" are not historical. These "saints," called "manes," "heroes," "nekyes," etc., are referred to in Bible prophecy. The downfall of monarchical government and the restoration of the government of the people—this Golden Age of tradition—is foretold by Daniel (ch. vii, 26, 27) in the following words:

"And judgment shall sit, that his power may be taken away, and be broken in pieces, and perish even to the end. And that the kingdom, and power, and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heaven, may be given to the *people* of the 'saints' of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all kings shall serve him, and shall obey him."

According to another translation, it is:

"But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him."

This must be interpreted in connection with what was foretold concerning the fourth great beast, or kingdom, which made war against the saints, and prevailed over them, until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the saints obtained the kingdom.

Osiris was styled the Ancient One (*Uon-as*), the Ancient of Days; but as the prophecy can not refer to Osiris, this title was used to describe the first, or most ancient, period of civilized man's existence upon the globe, when the government was vested in the saints or the *people* of the saints, and all dominions served and obeyed God instead of human kings.

The Pyramid Texts abound in references to these "saints," called "*achiu*," which signifies "luminous ones" or "glorified ones." This fundamental conception of "luminous" has always attached to "saints," as demonstrated by the symbolical halo encircling their heads, which is never wanting in ancient orthodox pictures of the saints.

The inscriptions in the pyramid of *Unas*, dating from ca. 3146 B. C., show that at this early date the saints were already regarded as extremely ancient, and were venerated next after the gods. The Egyptians always admitted that their language and complicated system of writing, and their arts, sciences, and religious notions had come down from the saints, in all their primitive perfection; and a careful study of the ancient monuments verifies this in every particular. The *Shemsu-Har*, or *Shesu-Har*, "Followers of Horus," also mentioned on the monuments, may be the "saints;" but I still have some doubt as to their identity. The First and Second Dynasties of Theonites reigned at *Ān-nu*, or Heliopolis, the most ancient capital of Egypt, and this city was sacred to Horus in all his forms. The damming of the western arm of the Nile, the foundation of Memphis, and the

construction of such monuments as the Sphinx, the Pyramids of Kochome, and the Temple of the Sphinx, followed by the works of the Third and Fourth Dynasties, show that the arts and sciences had reached their perfection before the kingdom was established.

The first king of the Memphite line erected the step-pyramid of Sakkara, which is, next to the Sphinx, one of the most ancient works to be found in the world. His name, *Nuter-achi*, or "Netherochis," still appears above the door of the sepulchral chamber.

### MANETHO'S GRAND TOTAL OF 3,555 YEARS

Syncellus has the following passage: "*The period of 113 generations, described by Manetho in his three volumes, comprises a sum total of 3,555 years.*" This sum has been correctly transmitted, for Syncellus reckons the 3,555 years from A. M. 1586 to A. M. 5147; the discrepancy of six years, between these dates, being easily explained. Placing the birth of Adam at 5500 B. C., Syncellus reckoned the 3,555 years from A. M. 1606 to A. M. 5161 (A. M. 1586 to A. M. 5141?) The "sum total of 3,555 years," therefore, extended from 3894 B. C. to 339 B. C., or from the beginning of the Memphite Kingdom to the end of the last Nectanebos' reign. There can be no doubt, either, that the one hundred and thirteen generations and 3,555 years were derived from Manetho; for we know, from other sources, that his history was written in three books. The three hundred and fifty years of the "Ten Thinite Kings," extending from 4244 B. C. to 3894 B. C. (A. M. 1256 to A. M. 1606), eluci-

date and sustain the succeeding total of 3,555 years. One set of totals has been recovered from Eusebius; the other total, fitting it like a piece of mosaic, comes from Syncellus, who, no doubt, copied it from Africanus.

When we come to the epoch-reign of the first Nectanebes (*Necht-har-heb* "Nectarebes") which dates from the epoch 364 B. C., we shall see that the above date, 339 B. C., is absolute.

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Epoch of Pachons, . . . . .                   | 364 B. C. |
| Nectarebes, as "Amyrtaios," . . . . .         | 6         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 358 B. C. |
| Teos, . . . . .                               | 2         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 356 B. C. |
| Nectanebos ( <i>Necht-neb-ef</i> ), . . . . . | 18        |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 338 B. C. |

In adapting the separate reigns to the Sothiac epochs, an *apparent* error of one year is often unavoidable, for the reason that the reigns, as transmitted to us in the lists, are reduced to years, although Manetho originally gave them accurately in years, months, and days.

PART II

A Self-Verifying Chronological History of  
Ancient Egypt, from the Foundation of  
the Kingdom to the Beginning of  
the Persian Dynasty

A BOOK OF STARTLING DISCOVERIES

GRAND TOTALS OF MANETHO'S FIRST  
BOOK

ACCORDING to the present lists, including the "Armenian Version" of Eusebius, the total number of kings in Manetho's first book was one hundred and ninety-two, and the total number of years 2,300. In the main, or chronological, line there were, including Amenemes (sixteen years of whose reign belong in the first cycle and first book), fifty-three kings and 1,460 years, as follows:

| Dynasties.                     | Kings | Sub-totals. |    | Years. | Total. |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------------|----|--------|--------|
| First Thinite, . . . . .       | 8     |             |    | 263    |        |
| Second Thinite, . . . . .      | 9     |             | 17 | 302    | 565    |
| Fourth Memphite, . . . . .     | 6     |             | 23 | 284    | 849    |
| Fifth Memphite, . . . . .      | 8     |             | 31 | 248    | 1097   |
| Sixth Elephantinean, . . . . . | 6     |             | 37 | 198    | 1295   |
| Seventh Memphite, . . . . .    | 6     | 12          | 43 | 6      | 1301   |
| Eighth Memphite, . . . . .     | 9     | 21          | 52 | 142    | 1443   |
| Amenemes I, . . . . .          | 1     | 22          | 53 | 16     | 1459   |

Adding one additional year, which was omitted by Africanus in reducing the “extra” months and days of Manetho to years, we have fifty-three kings and 1,460 years. But, as Africanus, by mistake, made the total of the First Dynasty two hundred and fifty-three instead of two hundred and sixty-three years, the total number of years appears to be 1,449. Now the side-lines foot up eight hundred and fifty-one years, making the grand total 2,300 years, as follows:

| Dynasties.                    | Kings.    |             | Years.     |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Third Memphite, . . . . .     | 9         | (9)         | 214        |
| Ninth Heracleopolite, . . . . | 19        | (5)         | 409        |
| Tenth Heracleopolite, . . . . | 19        | (19)        | 185        |
| Eleventh Theban, . . . . .    | 16        | (6)         | 43         |
|                               | <u>63</u> | <u>(39)</u> | <u>851</u> |

Eusebius mistook several of these sub-totals for the totals of separate dynasties. Thus he gave the Fourth Dynasty seventeen kings, and the Sixth Dynasty (now Fifth), thirty-one kings, and confused the lists in many other ways. These mistakes reacted on the lists of Africanus through Syncellus, who placed them in juxtaposition. Manetho summed up, at the end of the Sixth Dynasty, just as the Turin papyrus does, and, as we shall see, there were good and sufficient historical reasons for doing this. Repeated summation, between the Sixth and Twelfth Dynasties, has had the effect of throwing the present lists into a state of almost inextricable confusion; but I did not rest until I had succeeded in restoring Manetho’s chronological line, for it afforded me the means of

clearing up the equally perplexing errors which have crept into the lists extracted from Manetho's second book, and still serve as a support to some of the most preposterous hypotheses to be found in the annals of ancient history.

It is a most significant fact that, during periods of a divided kingdom, when there were no Pharaohs claiming to exercise universal dominion, the Manethonian lists fail to give the names or separate reigns of the kings. It seems that Manetho, in such cases, referred to the dynasties in a general way, merely giving the total number of kings and the duration of each dynasty.

As we shall see, it is certain that he gave the exact duration in years of the most important historical periods, such as the four hundred and fifty-three years of Theban rule before the Hyksos Flood, and the five hundred and eleven years of Hyksos domination immediately after it. The fifty-three kings who reigned 1,460 years to the beginning of the Sothiac era, 2784 B. C., are the same mentioned by Diodorus, to wit: Menes (not Tepnachtis) and his fifty-two successors, who reigned 1,400 plus sixty-two years. These fifty-three kings and the remaining seven kings of the Twelfth Dynasty, making a total of sixty kings, now appear at the head of the Thirteenth Dynasty, where we shall have occasion to refer to them more particularly.

Without going into details, I will state generally, that, as the five hundred and ninety-four years of the Ninth and Tenth Dynasties of Heracleopolis exactly

fill out the interval between the end of the Seventh Dynasty and the Hyksos invasion, I believe Manetho had them as follows:

| Dynasties.          | Kings.   | Years.    |
|---------------------|----------|-----------|
| Ninth, . . . . .    | 5        | 109       |
| Tenth, . . . . .    | 19       | 485       |
| Eleventh, . . . . . | 6        | 43        |
| Third, . . . . .    | 9        | 214       |
|                     | <hr/> 39 | <hr/> 851 |

This gives us ninety-two instead of one hundred and ninety-two kings. The change from one hundred and nine to four hundred and nine, and from four hundred and eighty-five to one hundred and eighty-five, in my opinion, was made in copying the list, by carelessly transposing the characters: P (100) and Y (400), whereby P⓪ (109) and YΠE (485) became Y⓪ (409) and PΠE (185).

This mistake appears in Barbarus, who copied from Africanus; but as he has twenty (twenty-four?) kings for the two Heracleopolite Dynasties, he may have obtained the four hundred and nine from four hundred and eighty-five.

After the number of kings in the Seventh Dynasty had been increased to seventy, the total, ninety-two, was raised to one hundred and ninety-two, the Eighth Dynasty was raised to twenty-one, a sub-total (now twenty-seven), the Ninth Dynasty to nineteen, and the Eleventh Dynasty to sixteen, the increase in the number of kings being respectively (70—6) sixty-four, (21—9) twelve, (19—5) fourteen, and (16—6) ten, which gave them the required extra one hundred kings.

Eusebius, in both versions, has four instead of five kings for the Ninth Dynasty. The solution of this apparent paradox can be found in Barbarus Scali-geri's extracts from Africanus, where such groupings as "Nechocheus, and eight others," "Othoes, and seven others," etc., justify us in assuming "Ochthoes and four others." In a case of this kind Eusebius would have been almost certain to get four instead of five kings.

**"TEN THINITE KINGS WHO REIGNED 350 YEARS"**

There were seventeen kings in Manetho's First and Second Thinite Dynasties. The eight kings of the First Dynasty reigned two hundred and sixty-three years, beginning 4244 B. C., and ending 3981 B. C. The nine kings of the Second Dynasty reigned three hundred and two years, beginning 3981 B. C., and ending 3679 B. C. The Third Dynasty, which was composed of Memphite kings, commenced to reign 3894 B. C., or eighty-seven years after the beginning of the Second Dynasty. The "ten Thinite kings who reigned three hundred and fifty years," therefore, were made up of the eight kings of the First Dynasty and first two kings of the Second Dynasty. The division of the kingdom and the establishment of the Memphite line took place in the eleventh year of Binothris. The Second Dynasty at Heliopolis and the Third Dynasty at Memphis reigned contemporaneously, or side by side, two hundred and fourteen years; and both came to a close simultaneously 3679 B. C., when Senoferu, the first

king of the Fourth Dynasty, whose wife, Mertitefs, united the claims of both lines, began to reign.

Eusebius tells us expressly that the Thinite and Memphite kings reigned contemporaneously, as did the Ethiopian and Saite kings, and others also. This remark was not the supposition of Eusebius, but was derived from Manetho's work, for Eusebius introduces it by, "We are told," etc.

Although the Second Dynasty continued to reign two hundred and fourteen years after the Third Dynasty was established, Manetho naturally and logically completed the former in his dynastic lists before he entered the latter. In the same manner he afterwards carried the Memphite line down to the close of the first cycle, 2784 B. C., before he took up the Heracleopolite and Theban side-lines, which date from about 2948 B. C.

There were three Sothiac epochs in this period of three hundred and fifty years. The epoch-kings, *Mena*, *Atoth*, and *Kebahu*, bore the epoch-titles "Athothis," "Kenkenes," and "Uennephis," and, strange to say, these epoch-titles have been substituted by mistake for the real names of the kings. Thanks to the New Table of Abydus, we are now prepared to clear up the many ridiculous mistakes to which this substitution has given rise.

#### MANETHO'S FIRST DYNASTY OF EIGHT THINITE KINGS

The "New Table of Abydus," engraved by order of Seti I about 1584 B. C., contains in perfect preservation the names of the first eight kings of Egypt,

the same assigned by Manetho to his First Dynasty. We are thus in possession of an ancient document, nearly 3,500 years old, by means of which we can detect the arbitrary changes made in Manetho's list by the early chronographers, through whose works the same has reached us. The second, third, and fourth names, or titles, in the Manethonian list differ so radically from the corresponding names in the table, that eminent Egyptologists, among them Maspero, have come to the conclusion that the Egyptians of Seti's times had no reliable accounts of these early kings, but depended on conjecture and vague traditions. Before we go farther, however, we will place the table and list in parallel columns:

## Table of Abydos.

## Manetho's List.

|                     |                  |
|---------------------|------------------|
| Mena, . . . . .     | Menea, 62 years  |
| Teta, . . . . .     | Athothis, 57 "   |
| Atoth, . . . . .    | Kenkenes, 31 "   |
| Ata, . . . . .      | Uen-nephis, 23 " |
| Usapti, . . . . .   | Usaphaidos, 20 " |
| Merbapen, . . . . . | Meibaes, 26 "    |
| Semsn, . . . . .    | Semempses, 18 "  |
| Quebahu, . . . . .  | Quebeches, 26 "  |

It will be seen at once that all of these names correspond perfectly except the second, third, and fourth. Athothis, Kenkenes, and Uennephis are epoch-titles belonging to the three epoch-kings of this dynasty, *Mena*, *Atoth*, and *Quebahu*, and have been inserted by some one in Manetho's list, where they now stand, in the place of *Teta*, *Atoth*, and *Ata*, probably rendered Tithoes, Athothis, and Athoes by Manetho. If the changes were made by the forger of the

pseudo-Sothis List, his purpose was, *first*, to cover up the fraud; and, *second*, to discredit Manetho's work. The effect, however, has been the reverse, for the epoch-reigns, inserted by him, furnish astronomically fixed points, from which the chronology of this period can be restored. The three epoch-reigns which have caused all this confusion will be treated of separately. It seems that the epoch-kings were mentioned in Manetho's history as well as in his book of Sothis, for Josephus, in his list of the Hyksos kings, has "Asses" instead of "Sethos" (*Set-Nubti*), the actual name of the king, and he copied the reigns, as he himself tells us, from the second book of Manetho's history, and not from the book of Sothis. Josephus also copied "Armais," the epoch-title of Thothmes III, from the same book, mistaking it for the name of a separate king.

Menes himself was the epoch-king Athothis; but the fifty-seven years assigned to Athothis belonged to Tithoes. The presence of Athothis in Manetho's list led to his insertion in the list of Eratosthenes, immediately after Menes. The third king, Athothis, from *Atoth*, was then called Athothis II. He still has his original reign of thirty-two years, thirty-one of which were as epoch-king "Kenkenes." The first Athothis, translated "Hermogenes," was *Aa-tahu-ti*, "Offspring of Thoth," although the Greek form of *Atoth* must have been Athothis also. As *Mena* reigned sixty-two years and *Teta* fifty-seven years, it required just one year of *Atoth's* reign to fill out the Sothiac month of one hundred and twenty years,

which leaves exactly thirty-one years for "Kenkenes." Adding the reigns of the succeeding kings to the thirty-one years of "Kenkenes," we have one hundred and seventeen years to *Quebahu*, and need the first three years of his reign to complete the second one hundred and twenty years. This leaves twenty-three years for the epoch-reign of *Quebahu*. The total of the entire dynasty is two hundred and sixty-three years, or twice  $120+23$ .

*Ata's* reign must have been twenty-two years, which coincided very closely with the epoch-reign of twenty-three years substituted for it.

The list can be restored as follows:

|                           |          |                            |          |
|---------------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------|
| <i>Mena</i> , . . . . .   | 62 years | " <i>Athothis</i> ," . . . | 62 years |
| <i>Teta</i> , . . . . .   | 57 "     |                            |          |
| <i>Atoth</i> , . . . . .  | 32 "     | " <i>Kenkenes</i> ," . . . | 31 "     |
| <i>Ata</i> , . . . . .    | 22 "     |                            |          |
| <i>Usapti</i> , . . . . . | 20 "     |                            |          |
| <i>Merbapen</i> , . . .   | 26 "     |                            |          |
| <i>Semsu</i> , . . . . .  | 18 "     |                            |          |
| <i>Quebahu</i> , . . . .  | 26 "     | " <i>Uennephis</i> ," . .  | 23 "     |
| Total, . . . . .          | 263 "    |                            |          |

The last king of this dynasty built the pyramids of Kochome (*Ka-kem*, "Black Bull"), mentioned by Manetho as still standing in his time. If there were any reason to doubt that these kings, from *Mena* on down, were actual historical kings, the pyramids erected by *Uonnofer* to mark the epoch of Athyr, 4004 B. C., must be regarded as the very best evidence that *Quebahu*, at least, actually lived and reigned in the vicinity of Memphis or On. But the moment

we acknowledge the last king of the dynasty as historical, we are forced to admit the claims of all the rest. The reigns of these kings were carefully registered. These registers showed how long each of them reigned in years, months, and days. The reigns themselves were adapted to, and checked by, the Sothiac epochs, so that mistakes were almost impossible.

These kings are now called "Thinite;" but the word itself came down in a somewhat different form. It was written "Theeinites" and "Theynites," showing that it was originally Theânites. The name was derived from *Ta-ânut*, "the land of *Ânu*," which was pronounced *Theânut* in Lower Egypt. The First Dynasty, therefore, was of *Ta-ânu*, and the city of *Ânu* was the most ancient capital of Egypt.


It has been contended that any chronological system which places *Mena* at the head of a Sothiac cycle is necessarily artificial, and must, therefore, be false. The date, 4244 B. C., was not the beginning of a Sothiac year, as originally arranged. In the fixed year Sirius rose heliacally on the first day of Pharmuthi, which corresponds to July 19th. When *Mena* became king the year had shifted around so that the rising of Sirius occurred on the first day of Thoth, which was six hundred and twenty years after the Sothiac year commenced. In other words, the year was normal about 4864 B. C., while the era dating from the accession of *Mena* commenced about 4244 B. C. The historical cycle, therefore, commenced six hundred and twenty years after the astronomical cycle. I believe this fact was expressly mentioned by

Manetho, because there is evidence that the 1,255 years of the "heroes" had been changed, at some time prior to Eusebius, to 1,855 years. Always bear in mind that the Egyptian year was normal when the fixed year, the vague year, and the Sothiac year coincided, which occurred about 4864 B. C., when the winter solstice coincided with the first day of Thoth, and Sothis rose heliacally on the first day of Pharmuthi; and that at the beginning of *Mena's* reign, or 4244 B. C., Sothis rose heliacally on the first day of Thoth, and the winter solstice fell on the fifth day of *Em-hir*. It is evident that *Mena* would stand at 4864 B. C. if he had been arbitrarily placed at the head of a Sothiac year. When Moses constituted the month in which the Hebrews departed from Egypt the beginning of the Hebrew year, he simply imitated the example of the Egyptians.

The "Ten Thinite Kings" of Manetho's general scheme, who reigned three hundred and fifty years from 4244 B. C. to 3894 B. C., were made up of these eight kings and the first two kings of the Second Dynasty. They were preceded by the *Achiiu* or "Saints," whose seat of government was also at On. As this period was afterwards referred to as the "Ancient of Days," the government of the "Saints" must have been a democracy. The buildings and monuments of Heliopolis, like those of Memphis, have disappeared from the face of the earth, and were it not for the pyramids, mastabas, and tombs on the opposite edge of the Libyan hills, the existence of both during the Old Empire might have been doubted by over-

skeptical critics. Fortunately, we learn from the "Stele of Cheop's Daughter" that the reclining sphinx was the emblem, in *Chufu's* time, of the youthful Horus in the second month of Paophi, just as "*Ken-ken*," "very brave," was one of his distinctive titles. The "Great Sphinx," which was one of the wonders of the ancient world and a riddle to all the uninitiated, still stands in matchless grandeur to mark the epoch of Paophi, 4124 B. C., and to bear witness to the power, civilization, and titanic art of the immediate descendants of the "Saints." King *Atoth* constructed the Great Sphinx as the symbol of Horus, under his title of *Ken-ken*. *Ata*, the name of the fourth king, in the course of time became synonymous with "Great King." The kings of the "New Empire" chose the title *Ati*, or *Atai*, in order to awaken in the hearts of their subjects increased feelings of awe and respect. The solution of the "riddle of the sphinx" was reserved for the close of the nineteenth century, so that it might follow immediately after the opening of the sealed book of ancient Egypt and the advent of the "Ancient of Days" in the "New World."

According to the ancient records as interpreted to Diodorus by the Egyptian priests, the magnificent temples and palaces of the "Memphite Kings" did not equal those of the "former kings" in state or grandeur. Let the reader endeavor to form a mental image of the "Great Sphinx" as it must have appeared in its original perfection, and then compare it with the grandest statues erected by Amenophis III, Seti I, and Ramesses II, and he will feel inclined



to believe that the temples and palaces erected at Heliopolis and Memphis by *Mena*, *Teta*, *Atoth*, and other kings of this dynasty were upon the same scale of grandeur.

The solitary obelisk now standing on the site of ancient *Anu* was erected by Usertasen I of the Twelfth Dynasty, *in front of the temple*. The last vestiges of this temple have disappeared; but no one competent to judge would dare to deny that it stood there at the beginning of the second historical cycle, 2784 B. C.

We know that the people of ancient Greece and Rome preserved and transmitted their history without engraving it in imperishable granite. Our own priceless literature is preserved in books of perishable paper. Now every candid person will admit that the ancient Egyptians, with their superior climate and favorable surroundings, might have preserved their history, etc., in writing on wooden tablets, or leather, and in books made of papyrus. Why, then, do scholars and critics persist in saying that the Egyptians had no authentic history, chronology, or literature of this period, when Herodotus, Plato, Eratosthenes, Diodorus, and other classic writers assure us that the records, annals, and papyri containing this literature were carefully preserved in the temples of Egypt, hundreds of which were to be found between Migdol and Syene? It is significant that the meager notices attached to the reigns of the Thinite kings, in the Manethonian lists, without exception, refer to Lower Egypt, and never mention "This" or Upper Egypt.

It is true that the "South" is mentioned in the inscriptions of the early kings of the succeeding Memphite Dynasty, but equally true that the "South" of this period was just above Heliopolis. At the end of the Fifth Dynasty, more than one thousand years after the accession of Menes, Osiris is called "Lord of Abydus;" but this Abydus may have been named after a more ancient Abydus of Lower Egypt. Many of the cities of Upper Egypt, like "*Ānu* of the South," were named after older cities of the Delta. Our own country abounds in examples of the same kind—cities named after cities of the Old World. As to *Mena*, all the authorities agree in calling him the "first king of Egypt." A fragment of the "Turin papyrus" styles him "the first" (lit. "head"). The foundation of Memphis was ascribed to him, and the name "*Men-nofer*," "Perfect Station," seems to be derived from his name. The form *Men-a* is equivalent to the later *Men-i*. The root is *men*, "firm," "established." Thus *men* also meant "station" in the sense of "landing" or "harbor;" transportation in ancient Egypt being principally by water, in boats instead of wagons. Eratosthenes translates Menes "Aionios," showing the close relationship of the forms *Men-nofer* and *Men-i*. The contrast between the liquid ways and firm landings of ancient Egypt, the instability of the roads and the stability of the stations, emphasizes the deep meaning and significance of such names as *Men-a* and *Men-nofer*.

According to a notice copied by Eusebius from Manetho's work, *Mena* invaded a foreign country.

No doubt this campaign was owing to incursions of neighboring nations. It required a united effort on the part of the Egyptians to repel these attacks, and the invasion of the foreign country by *Mena*, like that of *Meri-ra*, was retaliatory. The common danger, the success of the united effort, the subordination of the people generally to the will of the commander, led to the establishment of the kingdom. The extraordinary talents and abilities of the leader chosen by the people in the dark hours of common danger, brought out into bold relief by the successful issue of the struggle, reconciled the people to the loss of their ancient liberty. When Herodotus visited Egypt about 450 B. C., there were sacred registers preserved in the temples, showing that *Mena*, the first king of Egypt, in the first place protected Memphis by a mound, and then, beginning about one hundred stades above Memphis, dammed up the western arm of the Nile which then ran close to the Libyan hills, and, after the river had been confined to the main stream running through the middle of the valley, he built his new capital, Memphis, upon the site thus obtained. The notice in the Manethonian lists that "Athothis" constructed a palace in Memphis, agrees with the account read to Herodotus.

According to Diodorus, *Mena*, "the first king of Egypt," taught the people the adoration of the gods, and the manner of divine worship; he also taught them how to adorn their beds and tables with rich cloths and coverings, and was the first to introduce a luxurious mode of living. Speaking of Mneuis (an-

other form of Menes), Diodorus says he was a man of heroic spirit, and famous in his generation; that he was the first who instituted laws, pretending that he had received them from Mercury (Hermes-Thoth); and that great benefits and advantages would accrue to the people from their observance.

This author's account of the building of Memphis differs but slightly from that of Herodotus, if we only substitute Menes for Uchoreus, who is as much out of place here as Tephnaches. He tells us that Uchoreus (Menes) built Memphis, the most famous city of Egypt. He chose the most convenient place for it in all the country, selecting the point where the Nile divided itself into several branches, and formed that part of Egypt called the Delta. The city, being thus conveniently situated at the head of the river, commanded all the shipping that sailed up it. The city was built one hundred and fifty furlongs in circuit, and was made exceedingly strong and commodious. As the Nile flowed around the city, and at the time of the inundation covered all the land to the south of it, Uchoreus cast up a mighty rampart of earth, both as a defense to the city against the raging waters, and as a bulwark against an enemy on land; and on the other sides he dug broad and deep trenches to receive the surges of the river, and filled every place around the rampart with water, which fortified the city to admiration. He also built palaces not inferior to others built elsewhere, but much below the state and grandeur of the former kings. The memoranda jotted down by Diodorus concerning

Egypt were correct enough in themselves; but he evidently lost the connection before he incorporated them in his history, where they are jumbled together in almost hopeless and inextricable confusion. For example, the following: "They say the posterity of Tephnachthus, to the number of fifty-two, reigned for the space of 1,400 years, in which time there is nothing worthy of remark," relates to the fifty-two successors, in the direct line, of Menes, and was the total of Manetho's first historical cycle of 1,460 years. Of course, the concluding remark that nothing had been found relating to this long and eventful period which was worthy of remark, was a convenient way of disposing of matters and things too voluminous and troublesome to relate. We single out this example here to show that the sources from which Diodorus obtained the scraps to be found in his history were reliable, because there actually were fifty-three kings in the direct line, and 1,460 years from the accession of *Mena*, 4244 B. C., to the seventeenth year of Amenemes I, 2784 B. C., as shown by Manetho's lists and the native tables.

After this digression, which is due to the example of Diodorus, the reader will understand how the scrap about the palaces built by some other king, which were "much below the state and grandeur of the former kings," came to be added on to the account of the building of Memphis by *Mena*, and how Uchoreus came to be substituted for *Mena*.

Brugsch-Bey, following Linant-Bey, was satisfied that the great dike of Cocheiche is the same con-

structed by *Mena*. This dike still renders valuable service to the inhabitants of Lower Egypt by restraining the rush of the inundating waters. Large sluices in the dike are the only outlets for the water into the marshland around the site of ancient Memphis. By means of the dike and its sluices the water can be increased in the deeper basins, and the level of the river can be raised to the extent of three feet in the neighborhood of Cairo.

According to Brugsch, this dike is two miles south of the site of ancient Memphis. As the "fill" made by *Mena* to dam the western arm of the Nile, was one hundred stades, or eleven miles, above Memphis, those authors who have confounded it with the dike of Chocheiche have made a grievous mistake. The dike is the "mighty rampart" of Diodorus, the "mound" of Herodotus, the celebrated "*Anbu-het*," "White wall," of the ancient inscriptions.

According to the ancient native account, translated for the benefit of Herodotus, *Mena*, in the first place, dammed up the western arm of the Nile which flowed along the Libyan Hills, just as the Bahr-Yusuf still does south of the Fayum. In this way, he reclaimed a marsh, and converted it into a well-protected site for the future capital of the new kingdom. Thus we see that, besides being a great commander, statesman, and lawgiver, he was a genius in the arts essential to the welfare of the human race, and, although the poet has not yet been born who could adequately sing the praises of *Mena*, we are convinced that his dike and rampart and glorious capital sur-

passed the Great Sphinx and Great Pyramid as much as these do the statues and tombs of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties. How do the agnostics and orthodox theologians explain these colossal works of practical utility, these astounding masterpieces of engineering science, under the first king of ancient Egypt, more than six thousand years ago? In the language of L. A. Wood, Kentucky's greatest philosopher, "Egypt burst upon the world in history, a full-grown nation, with a full-blown civilization, in the flower of its matchless perfection."

Is it a wonder, then, that the name of *Mena*, in the *Minos* of the Greek, *Adam* of the Hebrew, *Menu* of the Sanskrit, *Mannus* of the German, and *Man* of the Saxon, became as familiar as a household word?

The Table of Sakkara contains but two of these kings, *Mer-bapen* and *Quebahu*. We do not know why the others were omitted, but it is possible that the kings of the Memphite Dynasty traced their descent through the two named. The fact that Manetho introduces a new dynasty after *Quebahu* goes to show that one line died out and another line took its place. We shall see that, during the two hundred and fourteen years of the parallel Thinite and Memphite Dynasties, kings selected from both dynasties afterwards served as "ancestors" to subsequent kings. In the Berlin Museum there is a medical papyrus containing the following passage:



"This is the beginning of the sum of all methods for the cure of bad leprosy. It was discovered in a writing of very ancient origin, in a writing case, un-

derneath the feet of the divine Anubis in the town of *Sochem*, at the time when the deceased *Usapti* was king. After his death, the writing was brought to the sanctuary of the deceased King *Senda*, on account of its miraculous power of healing."

The town of *Sochem* was situated on the west bank of the Nile, nearly opposite Heliopolis. It was afterwards called Letopolis. It thus appears that there was a shrine to Anubis, and, consequently, a temple, in the town of *Sochem*, as far back as the time of King *Usapti*. It is interesting to note that bad leprosy already prevailed at the very dawn of history, and that the sum of all the methods for its cure, which was considered as very ancient in *Usapti's* reign, was so far in advance of the methods in use when the papyrus was written that it was looked upon as miraculous. We are not told where the sanctuary of King *Senda* was located, but the transfer of the writing from the place where it was found, in the reign of *Usapti*, agrees with the change of dynasty which had taken place, and with the presence of another line of rulers at Memphis.

### THE EPOCH-REIGNS OF THE FIRST DYNASTY

We have just seen that Menes, "the first king of Egypt," headed the Sothiac year which commenced in 4244 B. C., when Sothis rose heliacally on the first day of Thoth of the vague year. This great era, therefore, marks the establishment of the kingdom in Egypt, after the close of the dominion of the *Ach-i-u*,



or "Saints," called "Manes," "Heroes," etc., by the Greeks. As Thoth presided over the first quarter of the year, and over the first month also, Menes assumed the appropriate epoch-title "Athothis," which is, in old Egyptian, *Aa-tahu-ti*, that is, "Hermogenes" or "Offspring of Thoth."

Menes' reign, according to Manetho and Eratosthenes, was sixty-two years, and, since we know, from the Table of Abydos, that he was not succeeded by a son called "Athothis," but by *Teta*, it follows that he himself was the epoch-king Athothis. In fact, *Aa-tahu-ti* is not the proper name of a king, but a Sothiac title only.

The two hundred and sixty-three years of the First Dynasty, extending, as they did, from 4244 B. C. to 3981 B. C., covered three Sothiac epochs, to wit, Thoth, 4244 B. C., Paopi, 4124 B. C., and Athyr, 4004 B. C. In this state of case, we can assume that Manetho originally had three epoch-titles in this dynasty, in addition to the proper names of the eight kings. Some one, evidently ignorant of the importance of these epoch-titles and epoch-reigns from the astronomical and chronological points of view, inserted them, by mistake, in Manetho's First Dynasty in place of *Teta*, *Atoth*, and *Ata*.

Now, going to the list of Eratosthenes, which was originally adjusted to the Sothiac epochs, but is now a mere wreck composed of fragments, some of which are out of place, we find, after Menes, with sixty-two years, and Athothis (?), with fifty-nine instead of fifty-seven years, a *second* Athothis with

thirty-two years. This second Athothis, now wanting in the Manethonian Lists, is certainly Atoth, the third king of this dynasty, and his reign of thirty-two years, thus fortuitously preserved, turns out to be a most valuable link in the chain of evidence sustaining and corroborating Manetho’s chronology of the Old Empire.

A simple computation will demonstrate that the epoch-reign of King Atoth was thirty-one years.

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Era of Menes, . . . . .                                | 4244 B. C. |
| Menes, as epoch-king Athothis, . . . . .               | 62         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 4182 B. C. |
| <i>Teta</i> (Tithoes), . . . . .                       | 57         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 4125 B. C. |
| <i>Atoth</i> , or Athothis II, before epoch, . . . . . | 1          |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 4124 B. C. |
| <i>Atoth</i> , as epoch-king “Kenkenes,” . . . . .     | 31         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 4093 B. C. |

Athothis I has the original fifty-seven years of *Teta*’s reign in Manetho’s list, but Kenkenes has the epoch-reign of thirty-one years, instead of the full thirty-two years of *Atoth*.

In order to understand the title Kenkenes, we must bear in mind that Horus, according to the ancient symbolism, was born at the winter solstice, and went through the successive stages of growth and development, such as youth, manhood, old age, etc. In the month of Paophi the youthful Horus was figured as a reclining sphinx gazing towards the eastern horizon, and bore the title *Ken-ken*, “Very Brave,”

a duplication of *ken*, "brave," "kuehn." The *reclining sphinx*, *Apis-bull*, *Nile*, etc., were symbols of his dormant strength. In the representation on the so-called "Stela of Cheops' Daughter" Horus is pictured as a babe in Messori, a boy wearing the sidelock in Thoth, and a reclining sphinx in Paophi.

It will be seen at a glance that Kenkenes is *Kenken* with the Greek termination "es," and that it is an epoch-title assumed by *Atoth* to mark the epoch 4124 B. C.

We have already expressed the conviction that the Great Sphinx, opposite the ancient capital Heliopolis, was hewn out of the living rock by King Atoth-Kenkenes to mark this epoch, and, that his tomb was probably in or near it.

"Uennephis," with twenty-three years, who now occupies the place of King *Ata*, is the epoch-title of *Kebahu*, the last king of this dynasty. Before explaining his title, we will now give the dynasty complete:

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Era of Meneu, . . . . .                            | 4244 B. C. |
| Meneu, as epoch-king "Athothis," . . . . .         | 62         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 4182 B. C. |
| Teta, . . . . .                                    | 57         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 4125 B. C. |
| Atoth, before epoch of Paopi 4124 B. C., . . . . . | 1          |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 4124 B. C. |
| Atoth, as epoch king "Kenkenes," . . . . .         | 31         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 4093 B. C. |
| Ata, . . . . .                                     | 22         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 4071 B. C. |

---

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <i>Brought forward</i> , . . . . .                     | 4071 B. C. |
| Usaphaidos, . . . . .                                  | 20         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 4051 B. C. |
| Meibaes, . . . . .                                     | 26         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 4025 B. C. |
| Semenpses, . . . . .                                   | 18         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 4007 B. C. |
| <i>Kebahu</i> , before epoch of Athyr, 4004 B. C., . . | 3          |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 4004 B. C. |
| <i>Kebahu</i> , as epoch-king Uennephis, . . . . .     | 23         |
|  | <hr/>      |
| End of Dynasty, . . . . .                              | 3981 B. C. |

Athyr is a form of Hathor, or *Haet-har*, "House of Horus." Hathor and Isis are but different names for the "cosmic house" out of which Horus emerges at sunrise and into which he retires at sunset. *Hus-et*, "House," and *Hus-ir*, "House of the Eye," are intimately related, the one (Isis) being feminine, the other (Osiris) masculine. The epoch-king *Kebahu*, instead of assuming a title of Isis, adopted the title *Uon-nofer*, "Perfect Being," or "Perfect One," which was one of the distinctive titles of Osiris, the consort of Isis. The present form "Uen-nephis" is an evident corruption of Manetho's Uen-nepher.

According to the Manethonian Lists, *Uon-nofer*, that is, *Kebahu*, as epoch-king, "built the pyramids of Kochome. The nome of *Ka-kem*, the "Black Bull," was situated in the southernmost point of the Delta, opposite the ruined pyramid of Abu-roesh, and, as the chief capital was then at Heliopolis in the same vicinity, I am convinced that Perring was right in

regarding this ruin as the pyramid built by Uennephis to mark the epoch of Athyr 4004 B. C.


The large pyramid of Abu-roash was built of hewn stones, some of which were of granite. This fact has been advanced as conclusive evidence that it could not have been built until after the reign of Toserthos, the second king of the Third Dynasty. The learned critics who have raised this objection, however, assume that the entire three hundred and two years of the Second Dynasty intervened between the First and Third Dynasties, when, in fact, as we shall demonstrate, there were only eighty-seven or eighty-eight years between the two. The "Step-pyramid," which was built by Necherochis, the first king of the Third Dynasty, is in horizontal stages, or steps, and was originally encased with hewn stones. This fact of itself negatives the idea that Toserthos was the first to build with hewn stones. As we shall see in the next chapter, Necherochis was an epoch-king, and his reign, divided by the epoch 3884 B. C., appeared in Manetho's work in some such manner as this:

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Necherochis, before the epoch, . . . . . | 10 years |
| Necherochis, after the epoch, . . . . .  | 28 "     |
|  | <hr/>    |
| Entire reign, . . . . .                  | 38 "     |

In the Lists of Africanus, this king has his epoch-reign only, to-wit, twenty-eight years, and, just as the remark appended to the epoch-reign of Menes now appears in the line originally given to Teta, the remark attached to the epoch-reign of *Nuter-achi* now

appears opposite to Toserthos. We can safely assume that Manetho mentioned the celebrated "Step-pyramid," which is by far the largest of all the pyramids of Sakkara, and the further fact that *Nuterachi* was the first king to build a pyramid in horizontal stages, or steps. The remark now attached to the reign of Toserthos was certainly derived from this. I venture the prediction that, when Mena-Athothis established the kingdom over the united countries, about 4244 B. C., the civilization of ancient Egypt had already attained its full perfection, and further, that this era marks the noonday, and not the dawn, of civilization. Such works as the damming of the western arm of the Nile, the foundation of Memphis, the hewing out and sculpturing of the Great Sphinx, the building of the pyramids of *Ka-kem*, near Heliopolis, in connection with such buildings as the temple of Ptah at Memphis, and the palaces of Menes, or Mneuis, at Memphis and Heliopolis, are well authenticated historical facts, the evident meaning of which no fair-minded critic can possibly misunderstand.

The Pyramid Texts show that Isis, Hathor and Osiris, Thoth, Ptah, Neith, Ra, Horus, Tum, Bast, Nut, Tef-nut, Min, and, in fact, the entire pantheon of so-called deities, were prehistoric; in other words, the *Ach-i-u*, or Manes, who preceded Mena, had personated and symbolized the various attributes of the "Hidden God," whose name, if known, was never written or spoken, to whom no temples were built, and of whom no image was ever made, but who was worshiped in spirit and in silence alone.



## **MANETHO'S SECOND AND THIRD DYNASTIES**

These dynasties will be treated together, because, after the end of the "three hundred and fifty years" of the first "ten Thinite kings," they ruled contemporaneously, side by side, for two hundred and fourteen or two hundred and fifteen years.

As the First and Second Thinite Dynasties reigned five hundred and sixty-five years, that is, from 4244 B. C. to 3679 B. C., and as the "1,797 years" of the "Memphite kings" follow immediately after the "three hundred and fifty years" of the "ten Thinite kings" in Manetho's "General Scheme," it follows, of course, that the last two hundred and fifteen years of the Second Dynasty were contemporary with the first two hundred and fifteen years of the "Memphite kings."

Bearing this in mind, the reader will be better able to appreciate a statement of Eusebius which has long puzzled Egyptologists. At the opening of his account of the Manethonian Dynasties this author says, "We must remember that there were, perhaps at one and the same time, several kings in Egypt," adding, "for we are told that the Thinites and Memphites reigned simultaneously, and likewise the Ethiopians and the Saïtes, and others also. Moreover, some seemed to have reigned in one place, some in another, each dynasty being confined to its own province, so that several kings did not rule successively, but different kings reigned at the same time in different places." (*Chronicon*, Can. I, 20: 3.)

It is easy to distinguish between the facts taken from Manetho's work, either directly, or, what seems more probable, through Africanus, and the deductions drawn therefrom by Eusebius himself. We expect to show the following contemporary dynasties:

1. Second Thinite and Third Memphite, . . . 215 years
2. Seventh and Eighth Memphite, Ninth Heracleopolite, and Eleventh Theban, . . . 148 "
3. Thirteenth Theban and Fourteenth Xoite, . 242 "
4. Sixteenth Theban and Seventeenth Hyksos, 260 "
5. Twenty-fourth Saite and Twenty-fifth Ethiopian, . . . 65 "

It will be seen that Eusebius named the first and last of these contemporaneous periods, to wit: "The Thinites and Memphites" and the "Ethiopians and Saïtes," and merely referred to the others as "others also." When he says: "Some seem to have reigned in one place, some in another, each dynasty being confined to its own province," he referred to the period of one hundred and forty-eight years between the Sixth and Twelfth Dynasties, and the first two hundred and fifty-one years of the Hyksos domination over Egypt. The celebrated inscription of the Ethiopian king, *Pa-anchi*, describes just such a condition of affairs in Egypt, each nome, or province, having its own local ruler, some of whom assumed the title of king. The division of the kingdom occurred in the eleventh year of the reign of King Binothris, under whom, according to Manetho, the law was established that females might obtain the regal dignity. We must infer that his predecessor on the throne had no male issue, and that a *disputed suc-*

cession was settled by allowing the crown to pass to the daughters of the deceased king. There are many instances, notably in the Eighteenth Dynasty, of the crown passing in the female line, in which cases the husband of the queen ruled in her right, and was, therefore, regarded as king.

The fragments of the "Turin papyrus" containing the names of the kings of this period, show that there were not only two, but even three, separate lines of kings at this time, all of whom have the customary title, "King of the South and King of the North."

Before comparing the various lists and tables of these contemporary lines, we will say a few words about the first kings of Manetho's Third Dynasty, inasmuch as all attempts to identify them with the actual names on the monuments must be pronounced dismal failures.

#### 1. NUTER-ACHI, OR NECHER-OCHIS


Fragment forty-two of the "Turin papyrus" contains a name which reads *Nuter-achi*, "divine body." It was usual to abbreviate the names placed in the royal ovals, and this name is not only abbreviated, but the hieratic signs are placed in the most convenient positions, so that the horizontal sign for *r* appears under the horizontal sign for *achi*, and the two vertical blades representing the *i* of *achi* are behind the vertical hatchet which here stands for the *nu* of *nuter*. When we once know that the name is *Nuter-achi*, there can be no further difficulty or doubt as to the correct reading.

We now request the reader to turn to the unar-

ranged names in Lepsius' "Book of Kings." No. 765 is our King *Nuter-achi*. The name here is so simple that it admits of no possible doubt. The *i* of *achi* is wanting; but, as was the case with all the most ancient kings, his Horus-title, his title as "King of Upper and Lower Egypt," and his title as "Lord of Diadems," is simply *Nuter-achi*. In addition to this, we find "Golden Ra," which seems to be the "Golden Horus" of later times.

The first king of the Memphite Dynasty, who began to reign 3894 B. C., judging from the form Binuthris (which is a corrupted Binuthris), was "Nutherochis." This name now appears as "Necherophis" and "Necherochis," forms which have been derived from Nutherochis, unless Manetho really rendered it "Necherochis." The epoch of Choiak, 3884 B. C., fell in the eleventh year of this king's reign, and, as his predecessor, *Quebahu*, built the Pyramids of Khome to mark the epoch of Athyr, 4004 B. C., we are justified in assuming that *Nuter-achi* followed his example, and also constructed a pyramid to mark the epoch of Choiak, 3884 B. C. Who has not read about the most venerable of all the extant pyramids, the "Step-Pyramid" of Sakkara? Who is not aware that many eminent scholars, upon beholding the timeworn pile, were tempted to confound it with the Tower of Babel? All know that it is, unlike the Pyramids of Ghizeh, immediately opposite the site of ancient Memphis.

But what will the reader say when he learns that around the door which leads into the sepulchral cham-



ber of this pyramid, the name *Nuter-achi* appears repeated over and over again. There can be no doubt that this pyramid, rising in successive stages to the apex, is the tomb of the *first* king of the Memphite Dynasties, and that it was erected, as a witness to future ages, to mark the great astronomical epoch 3884 B. C. Is it a wonder that this spot was considered to be peculiarly sacred by after-generations, and became a favorite place of sepulture? The subterranean galleries under this pyramid are so extensive, and constitute such a maze, that it would be dangerous for any tourist to venture into them without a thoroughly competent and experienced guide.

Under *Nuter-achi* the Libyans revolted from Egypt, but made their submission on account of a sudden increase in the moon's size, which terrified them. No doubt this sudden *change* in the moon's appearance was owing to an eclipse, and I hope some astronomer will take the trouble to ascertain, and inform us, just when this eclipse took place between the years 3894 B. C. and 3856 B. C. *Nuter-achi* worked the mines in the Sinaitic peninsula, as shown by his inscription in that region. Thus the first king of the Third Memphite Dynasty was powerful enough to hold the Libyans and the peninsula of Sinai in subjection.

## 2. SA-ZOSERT, SESORTHOS, TOSORTHROS

The successor of *Nuter-achi*, on fragment forty-two of the "Turin papyrus," was *Sa-zosert*. Of course, the "z" of this name represents "ts," and was long afterwards rendered sometimes "t," sometimes "s."

Africanus has Toserthros, while Eusebius has Sesorthos. Manetho probably had "Setoserthos," for he rendered *Zoser-teta* "Tosertasis." I know of no instance in the "Turin papyrus" in which the sign for "*Zoser*" is written phonetically, as in the "Pyramid Texts," but the latter show unmistakably that the sign was pronounced *Zoser*. Hence the *Sa* of *Sa-zosert*, in the papyrus, is an integral part of the name, as still shown by Sesorthos. The extra *r* of Soserthros indicates that there was an *r* near the end of the name. All these indications point to Setoserthos. It may be that Tosertasis, following so close after this name, had something to do with the loss of the initial *Se*. So much for the name itself.

The reigns of Binothris and Necherochis closed about the same time, which goes to show that they were intimately connected. *Utnas*, of the Thinite line, and *Sazosert*, of the Memphite line, ascended the throne about the same time, and reigned side by side for seventeen years. This fact sheds some light on the name of the eighth king in the list of Eratosthenes. It now reads "Ogdoos Gosormies," a strange corruption of the original "Otnos Tosorthos." This reign, in Eratosthenes, is thirty years. Manetho gives Soserthos twenty-nine years. Both may be equally correct. Necherochis reigned twenty-eight years after the epoch 3884 B. C. As this is a round number, we can not tell how the extra months and days were apportioned. Binothris reigned, in years, twenty before, and twenty-seven after, the epoch 3884 B. C. Now  $28+29=27+30$ .

What we wish to demonstrate is that the first four kings of Manetho's Third Dynasty belong to the line set forth on fragment forty-two of the papyrus, and that the fifth and sixth kings, Soyphis and Tosertasis, were taken from a different line, named on fragment eighteen of the papyrus, where they are preceded by *Nofer-ka-sokari*, *Huzefa*, *Zaza-i*, and *Neb-ka*. The Table of Abydos, after the eight kings of the First Dynasty, honors *Buzau*, *Ka-kau*, *Ba-n-nuter*, *Utnas*, and *Senda*, who are the first five kings of Manetho's Second Dynasty. After *Senda*, however, it leaves the Thinite line, and takes up *Zaza-i*, *Nebka*, *Zoser-sa-uf* (Soyphis), and *Zoser-teta* (Tosertasis). There is nothing extraordinary about this after we know that these three separate lines, each of which was regarded as equally legitimate, reigned contemporaneously. As they were all related, and no doubt intermarried, subsequent kings of Egypt could, with equal propriety, select their ancestors out of either line. It seems that *Senoferu*, the first king of the Fourth Dynasty, united in his person the claims of all three lines. Thus the three lines which proceeded from Kaiechos, the last of Manetho's "ten Thinite kings," were again united after two hundred and fifteen years, in the person of *Senoferu*, who became a Memphite king. In the tomb of *Sheri* we find the names of *Senda* and *Per-son*, either as joint-rulers or successive kings. As *Per-son* was not a Thinite or Memphite king, he must have belonged to the third line.

Tosertasis was a celebrated epoch-king, whose reign commenced 3764 B. C. His predecessor, Soy-

phis, was distinguished in the papyrus by having his name displayed in red ink, and placed at the head of a new section. This was because his reign extended down to the beginning of the epoch of Tybi, which was also the beginning of a new season and Phoenix period.

The sixth king in the list of Eratosthenes, "Mom-cheiri Memphites," with a reign of seventy-nine years, is one of the best examples of how careless copyists have mutilated the original names. Menes is termed "Thinites;" hence "Memphites" indicates that a *part* of this long reign, at least, belongs to a Memphite king. Eratosthenes joined Utnas and Toserthos; hence he must have had Necherochis also, because "Memphites" could have applied to no other Memphite king. It follows that Eratosthenes amalgamated the reigns of Kaiechos, of the Thinite line, and Necherochis, of the Memphite line, estimating the two at seventy-nine years. This procedure on the part of Eratosthenes adds great weight to the theory that Kaiechos died without male issue, and that, after ten years, the disputed succession was settled by allowing the crown to descend to his three daughters, each of whom received a certain part of the kingdom. Binothris and Necherochis each reigned in the right of one of these daughters. It is to be hoped that some fortunate discovery may yet shed additional light on this interesting period of Egyptian history. In the following table the kings of these lines are placed in parallel columns:

| II DYNASTY.                                      | TABLE OF<br>ABYDOS.              | TABLE OF<br>BAKKAH.                 | TURIN.   | PAPYRUS.                          | III DYNASTY.                                     | HIERACONTHEMNA.                       |
|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1 Boethos<br>2 Kalechos                          | Buzau<br>Kakau                   | Nuter-bau<br>Kakau                  | Fr. 20 and 21<br>Nuter-bau<br>Kakau                            | Fr. 42<br>Nuter-achi<br>Sa-zoer-t | 1 Necherobis<br>2 Saoribos                       | Moncheiri Memphis<br>Oinoo Tosermites |
| 3 Binobris<br>4 Utas                             | Ba-n-nuter<br>Utias              | Ba-n-nuter<br>Utias                 | Ba-n-nuter<br>Utias<br>Fr. 19<br>Sende<br>Nuter-ka             | Mer....<br>Mer....                | 3 Tyres (Myres)<br>4 Mesochris                   | Mares                                 |
| 5 Sethenes<br>6 Chaires<br>7 Nephhereres         | Senda<br>Zazai<br>Neb-ka(!)      | Senda<br>Nofet-ka-ra                | Fr. 18<br>Nofet-ka-sokari<br>Huzefa                            |                                   |  |                                       |
| 8 Seochris<br>9 Cheneres                         |                                  | Nofet-ka-sokari<br>Huzefa<br>Zazai  | Fr. 18<br>Nofet-ka-sokari<br>Huzefa<br>Zazai                   |                                   |  |                                       |
| III Dynasty.                                     |                                  |                                     |  |                                   |  |                                       |
| 5 Soryphis<br>6 Toseruas<br>7 Aches<br>8 Sethois | Zoer-ua (uf)<br>(Zoer)ka<br>Sezo | Zoer-sauf<br>Zoer-teta<br>Neb-ka-ra | Neb-ka<br>Zoer-sauf<br>Zoer-teta<br>Fr. 31<br>Hual<br>Senoferu |                                   | 5 Soryphis<br>6 Toseruas<br>7 Aches<br>8 Sethois | Anorphis<br>Chubos Gaeuros            |
| 9 Kerpheres                                      | Nofet-ka-ra<br>Senoferu          | Hual<br>Senoferu                    |  |                                   | 9 Kerpheres                                      |                                       |

The Table of Abydus, which has come down to us in almost perfect preservation, and certainly received the sanction and approval of Seti I, one of the greatest kings that ever ruled over Egypt, must be accepted as the best evidence attainable at that time, about 1584 B. C. The inscription over the seventy-six names, coupled with the representation of Seti and his infant son, Ramesses, at the left side of the table, shows that the king and his son were doing homage to their distinguished "ancestors" (*uahu-chet*), who had been *Suten Buti*, that is, "King of the South and King of the North." When we consider that no king of the Eleventh, Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Sixteenth, or Seventeenth Dynasties was admitted to this list, we are driven to the conclusion that it contains such only as ruled over the original "Land of *Ânu*," or *Ta-ân-nut*, and no others. The fact that nine kings appear in the table between Kaiechos and Senoferu (the exact number of Manetho's Third Dynasty) shows that this period differed radically from the others just referred to. The conditions were such that Binôthris could be enrolled as king of Upper and Lower Egypt, notwithstanding the more powerful reign of Necherochis at Memphis. Are we not compelled to assume that these kings ruled jointly, and were of equal dignity? The successor of *Sazosert*, or Sesorthos, in Manetho's Third Dynasty, is Tyres. The corresponding name on fragment forty-seven of the papyrus is destroyed. Eratosthenes calls this king Mares, translated "Heliodorus," and gives him a reign of twenty-six years. The Egyptian

for Heliodorus is *Mer-ra*, pronounced in Manetho's time *Mei-re*. Tyres, therefore, should be Myres, and the seven years assigned to him should be twenty-seven. The fragments of the papyrus belonging to this period show many names beginning with *mer*; for example, *Mer-bapen*, *Mer-sokari*, etc., so that no objection can be urged to the form *Mer-ra*. Manetho renders *Mersokari* "Mesochris," which makes the form "Meires," or "Myres," very probable.

The following changes have been made in the Africanian list of the Third Dynasty:

1. Necherochis, whose reign was thirty-eight years, now has the twenty-eight years of his epoch-reign, which are equivalent to the twenty-seven years of the epoch-reign of Binothris.

2. Tyres, Myres, or Mares, now has seven years only, although his reign was twenty-seven years. Eratosthenes gave Sesorthos thirty and Mares twenty-six years. Manetho gave them respectively twenty-nine and twenty-seven years.

3. Soyphis now has the six years of Tosertasis, since increased to sixteen, to balance the ten years taken from Necherochis.

4. Tosertasis has the nineteen years of Söyphis.

5. Aches, who reigned twenty-two years, now has forty-two years, to balance the twenty years deducted from the reign of Mares.

The epitomists knew that the total of this dynasty was two hundred and fourteen years, and, after the reigns of Necherochis and Tyres had been reduced to twenty-eight and seven years respectively, under-

took to correct the errors and make the reigns foot up two hundred and fourteen years, by adding ten years to the reign of Soyphis and twenty years to the reign of Aches.

Soyphis (*Sa-uf-u*) appears in the list of Eratosthenes as Anoyphis, with a reign of twenty years. "Anoyphis" comes from a careless copyist, who mistook the final syllable of "*ebasileusen*" for the first syllable of "Soyphis," which followed immediately after it. In the list of Eratosthenes all the kings are expressly termed "Theban," that is to say, kings who ruled over the Thebais. Now, since we have shown that the kings of the Third Dynasty ruled contemporaneously with the Thinite kings, *it is significant that the Memphite and not the Thinite kings were regarded as Theban kings*, because it shows that the Thinite kings reigned in the Delta, and not between Memphis and Thebes.

The lists of Manetho and Eratosthenes compare as follows:

| Manetho.                  |   | Eratosthenes.             |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Kaiechos, . . . . . 39    | } | Momcheiri Memphites, 79   |
| Binothris, . . . . . 10   |   | Stoichos, . . . . . 6     |
| Necherochis, . . . . . 38 |   | Otnoos Tosermites, . . 30 |
| Toserthos, . . . . . 29   |   | Mares, . . . . . 26       |
| Tyres, . . . . . 27       |   | Soyphis, . . . . . 20     |
| Soyphis, . . . . . 19     |   | Chnubos Gneuros, . . 22   |
| Aches, . . . . . 22       |   |                           |

As nothing but fragments of the list of Eratosthenes have come down to us, the perfect agreement of the foregoing series is certainly remarkable.

The Table of Abydus has *Sezos* and *Nofer-kara*



between *Zoserteta* and *Senoferu*, and *Neb-ka-f* before *Soyphis*, while the Table of Sakkara has *Neb-ka-ra* after *Tosertasis*.

The form *Neb-ka-f*, literally "the Lord, his Ka," like *User-ka-f*, which Manetho converted into *User-ka-ra* and rendered "Usercheres," is equivalent to *Neb-ka-ra*, *ra* being understood. It is even possible that *ra* was inserted in all these names at a later period. I believe that *Neb-ka*, *Neb-ka-f*, and *Neb-ka-ra* of the papyrus and tables stand for one and the same king. If this be true, it is possible that an error was made as far back as *Seti*'s time in the transition from the Thinite to the Memphite line, immediately after King *Senda*, for, as we have already shown, *Senda* belonged to one line, and *Zazai*, *Nebka*, *Zoser-sauf*, and *Zoser-teta* to another. What is most essential, the chronology of the period has not been affected, but is as certain as could be wished. The Second and Third Dynasties both end, in the Sothiac series, at 3679 B. C., as the following table will show:

| Thinites.                 |            | Memphites.               |
|---------------------------|------------|--------------------------|
| Epoch of Athyr, . . . . . | 4004 B. C. |                          |
| Ten-nephis, . . . . .     | 23         |                          |
|                           | <hr/>      |                          |
|                           | 3981 B. C. |                          |
| Boethos, . . . . .        | 38         |                          |
|                           | <hr/>      |                          |
|                           | 3943 B. C. |                          |
| Kaiechos, . . . . .       | 39         | Third Dynasty, . . . . . |
|                           | <hr/>      | 3894 B. C.               |
|                           | 3904 B. C. |                          |
| Binothis, before          |            | Necherochis, be-         |
| epoch, . . . . .          | 20         | fore epoch, . . . . .    |
|                           | <hr/>      | 10                       |
|                           | 3884 B. C. | <hr/>                    |
|                           |            | 3884 B. C.               |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <i>Brought forward</i> , 3884 B. C.       | 3884 B. C.                              |
| Binothis, after<br>epoch, . . . . 27      | Necherochis, after<br>epoch, . . . . 28 |
| 3857 B. C.                                | 3856 B. C.                              |
| Utnas, . . . . . 17                       | Sesorthos, . . . . . 29                 |
| 3840 B. C.                                | 3827 B. C.                              |
| Sethenes, . . . . . 41                    | Myres, . . . . . 27                     |
| 3799 B. C.                                | 3800 B. C.                              |
| Chaires, . . . . . 17                     | Mesochris, . . . . . 17                 |
| 3782                                      | 3783 B. C.                              |
| Nephercheres, be-<br>fore epoch, . . . 19 | Soyphis, before<br>epoch, . . . . . 19  |
| 3763 B. C.                                | 3764 B. C.                              |
| Nephercheres, af-<br>ter epoch, . . . . 6 | Tosertasis, after<br>epoch, . . . . . 6 |
| 3757 B. C.                                | 3758 B. C.                              |
| Sesochris, . . . . . 48                   | Aches, . . . . . 22                     |
| 3709 B. C.                                | 3736 B. C.                              |
| Chenerea, . . . . . 30                    | Sethosis, . . . . . 30                  |
| 3679 B. C.                                | 3706 B. C.                              |
|   | Kerpheres, . . . . . 26                 |
|   | 3680 B. C.                              |

We now see what an irreparable loss science has sustained by reason of the accident to the "Turin papyrus," which was a complete list of the kings of Egypt from the first king, Menes, down to the Eighteenth Dynasty, giving their reigns in years, months, and days. It was in perfect preservation when discovered, but the unfortunate owner seems to have had no appreciation of its value or importance. The fragments which have been recovered are often aggravatingly small, and the names are sometimes de-

stroyed and lost where they are most needed. How we should like to know who preceded *Huni*, and who followed *Nuter-ka*, in the papyrus; to which line *Sezos* belonged, etc. The papyrus no doubt explained all this satisfactorily. We are, therefore, yet in the dark as to how the first four kings of the Third Dynasty, chosen from one line, and the remaining kings, taken from another and separate line, could all have ranked as Memphite kings.

Before leaving these dynasties, we can not refrain from noticing certain opinions expressed by Maspero in his latest work, "The Dawn of Civilization," which are necessarily entitled to much weight on account of his eminence as an Egyptologist. He says, on page 236, in effect, that the immediate successors of *Mena* have but a semblance of reality such as he had:

"The lists give the order of succession, it is true, with the years of their reigns almost to a day, sometimes the length of their lives, but we may well ask whence the chroniclers procured so much precise information. They were in the same position as ourselves with regard to these ancient kings; they knew them by a tradition of a later age, by a fragment of papyrus fortuitously preserved in a temple, by accidentally coming across some monument bearing their names, and were reduced, as we are, to put together the few facts which they possessed, or to supply such as were wanting, by conjectures, often in a very improbable manner. It is quite possible that they were able to gather from the memory of the past the names of those individuals of which they made up the first two Thinite Dynasties. The forms of these names are curt and rugged, and indicative of a rude and savage state,

harmonizing with the semi-barbaric period to which they are relegated: Ati, the Wrestler; Teti, the Runner; Quenqoni, the Crusher, are suitable rulers for a people, the first duty of whose chief was to lead his followers into battle, and to strike harder than any other man in the thickest of the fight. . . .

“Where Manetho inscribes Kenkenes and Uen-nephis, the tables of the time of Seti I give us Ati and Ata; Manetho reckons nine kings to the Second Dynasty, while they register only five. . . . We must, therefore, take the record of all this opening period of history for what it is, namely, a system invented at a much later date, by means of various artifices and combinations, to be partially accepted in default of a better, but without according to it that excessive confidence which it has hitherto received. The two Thinite Dynasties, in direct descent from the fabulous Menes, furnish, like this hero himself, only a tissue of romantic tales and miraculous legends in the place of history.”

We might quote pages, and even chapters, in the same strain, but the above will serve as an example. We read and wonder how one of the most distinguished interpreters of the hieroglyphic inscriptions of the ancient Egyptians could have developed into such an agnostic as to the history, literature, and civilization of the people to whom he has devoted the best energies of his life. It is true that the “Turin papyrus” is now reduced to a number of mutilated and unconnected fragments, but it does not follow therefrom that the ancient Egyptians of the times of *Aahmes* and *Seti I* “were in the same position as ourselves with regard to these ancient kings,” or that they “knew

them by a *fragment* of papyrus fortuitously preserved in a temple." The fact that the "Turin papyrus," which dates, according to Maspero, from the reign of Seti I, or, as I am convinced, from the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty, where it closes, survived the countless vicissitudes of time and the destructive hand of man, and reached us in a perfect state of preservation, alone negatives the idea that the ancient Egyptians themselves depended on *fragments* of papyrus, or "accidental monuments bearing the names of kings." In Egypt, where the rocks to-day contain inscriptions which can be estimated by the square mile, there was never a time when the temples, tombs, and even private houses, were not full of writings of all kinds bearing on the early history of Egypt. We are told that the forms of these names are "curt and rugged, and indicative of a rude and savage state," and in order to prove the assertion, the author invents the name "Quenqoni, the Crusher." Unfortunately for himself, he gives us, on the opposite page, a picture of the stela in the form of a door from the tomb of *Sheri*. In the first place, there never was such a name as "Quenqoni, the Crusher." In the second place, no king of these dynasties bore the name "Quenqoni." In the third place, King Atoth, not "Ati, the Wrestler," assumed the epoch-title *Ken-ken*, "Very Brave," which was not at all rude or savage, but so refined and emblematic that I fear this enlightened generation itself will have much difficulty in grasping and fully understanding it.

These names, including Uennephis, are said to har-

monize with the semi-barbaric period. When we realize that *Uon-nofer*, "the Perfect Being," "the Perfect One," was one of the titles of Osiris, and that Osiris was the symbol and personation of everything that was good and perfect, and that no other nation ever had such a symbol, we are compelled to admit that, instead of being "rude and barbaric," the civilization of this period has never seen its equal, except in true ideal Christianity. Why does the learned author omit the name *Mena* from those characterized as "curt and rugged?" This name, which has become a household word in every civilized nation on earth, contains, *in itself*, a refutation of the charge, which is crushing and decisive. If the defamers of Egyptian civilization would take the time to translate and analyze Mena's epoch-title, Athothis-Hermogenes, "*Offspring of Thoth*," that is, offspring of the symbol of learning and wisdom, and bear in mind that this same Thoth is represented in the mines of Sinai as conferring upon *Chufu II* the power to overcome the barbarous *Mentiu*, they would hide their heads in shame. What is there rude or savage, or even semi-barbaric, on the stele from *Sheri's* tomb of King *Senda's* time? *Sheri* himself is represented with the head, features, and equally-developed brain of a civilized man. It is true his costume is like that worn by Adam in the Garden of Eden, but this is simply one of many facts going to prove that Egypt was the Garden of Eden; for such a costume, worn alike by king, noble, and priest in Egypt, was, from the beginning of history, a physical impossibility in Babylonia or Assyria. *Sheri* has not

fastened to his waist the sword or dagger of semi-civilized man, but he holds in his hand the peaceful "staff of office," which Maspero himself tells us was "a symbol of command which only the nobles and the officials associated with the nobility could carry without transgressing custom."

The inscriptions on this "stela," which include the ovals of *Senda* and *Per-son*, show that the language, arts, and sciences of the Egyptians were already fully developed at this early date. The king himself bears the title *Hon-nuter*, "Servant of God," a title more eloquent and convincing than volumes of so-called scientific and priestly lore, grander and more sublime than any ever since borne by king or potentate, and yet so refined and highly civilized that it must have been an heirloom from primitive perfect man, handed down from the Golden Age. This same agnosticism, falsely called *science*, assumed that Osiris was unknown in the Old Empire, and, basing itself upon this assumption, claimed that the coffin of Menkaura was the work of a later age, because the inscription on its lid contained the name of Osiris. As Thoth is pictured on an early monument of the Fourth Dynasty, true *science* would have assumed that the people who had symbolized Wisdom, and (as shown by other monuments) the Truth, the Way, and the Life, had also symbolized, or personated, Good and Evil. In fact, the supposed "gods," "triads," "great enneads," and "little enneads," of Maspero, were not gods at all, but simply symbolizations and allegorical personations of divine attributes. Since the inscriptions in

the pyramids of *Unas*, *Teta*, *Meri-ra*, etc., have been discovered and published, we *know* that Osiris and Isis, Hathor, Seth, and Nephthis, Neith, Anubis, *Seb* and *Nut*, *Num*, Horus, *Ra*, *Tum*, Thoth, Amen, Muth, and all the other so-called gods or deities, were as well known in the Old Empire as they were at any later period.

In the same way, it is claimed, with as little reason, that the "Stela of Cheops' Daughter" was the work of a later age.

#### ZOSER-SA-UF AND ZOSER-TETA

Maspero translates, and discusses in the same vein, an inscription on a rock in the Island of Sehel, discovered by Wilbour in 1890. This inscription is attributed to *Zoser-sa-uf*, called Zosiri by Maspero, and Tosertasis by Pleyte, and sets forth that, in the eighteenth year of his reign, he sent to the governor of Elephantinè a message couched in these terms: "I am overcome with sorrow for the throne, and for those who reside in the palace, and my heart is afflicted and suffers greatly because the Nile has not risen in my time for the space of eight years. Corn is scarce, there is a lack of herbage, and nothing is left to eat; when one calls on his neighbors for help, they take pains not to go. The child weeps, the young man is uneasy, the hearts of the old men are in despair, their limbs are bent, they crouch on the earth, they fold their hands; the courtiers have no further resources; the shops formerly furnished with rich wares are now empty, all that was in them has disappeared. My

*spirit also, mindful of the beginning of things, seeks to call upon the Saviour who was here where I am, during the centuries of the gods, upon Thoth, the great wise one; upon Imhotep, son of Ptah, of Memphis. Where is the place in which the Nile was born? Who is the god or goddess concealed there? What is his likeness? (Dawn of Civilization, pages 240 and 241.)* The governor of Elephantinè repaired to King Soyphis, described the situation of the island, the rocks of the cataract, the phenomena of the inundation, and the gods who presided over it, and alone could relieve Egypt from her disastrous plight. After this Soyphis, or Tosertasis, went to Elephantinè and offered the prescribed sacrifices in the temple of Num.

Maspero says this inscription shows us with what ease the scribes could forge official documents. "It teaches us at the same time how that fabulous chronicle was elaborated, whose remains have been preserved for us by classical writers. Every prodigy, every fact related by Manetho, was taken from some document analagous to the supposed inscription of Zosiri."

Again we pause in blank amazement. No matter when the inscription itself was *engraved* in the rock, the subject matter, name of the king, and style of the text mark it as genuine.


After *Zoser-sa-uf* had reigned nineteen years (the papyrus seemingly gives him nineteen years, two months, and four days) as Soyphis, "the Saviour," the Sothiac month of Choiak came to an end and the epoch of Tybi, 3764 B. C., commenced. Unless he

died about this exact time, *Zoser-teta*, "Tosertasis," is but another title for this king, "re-born" and re-crowned" on the first day of the new month and new season, 3764 B. C. For this reason, his name was *displayed* in the papyrus, and for this reason, perhaps, he is termed *Teta* only in the Table of Abydos.

The inscription, as translated by Maspero himself, relates that in the eighteenth year of *Zoser-sauf* the Nile had not risen for eight years, and that the message to the governor of Elephantinè was sent in this year. It is evident that the text is allegorical, and refers to the coming epoch, which was determined by the heliacal rising of Sothis on the first day of Tybi. The allusions to the "beginning of things," and the "Saviour" (*Sa-uf-u*), who was there where he was, "during the centuries of the gods," is a play upon his own name, Soyphis. There may be a deep significance in this "Saviour," who was there at the "beginning of things." Joseph's title, "Saph-nath-pa-aneah," contains the same element, *Sa-uf*, or "Saviour," and is, in pure Egyptian, *Sauf-na-ta-pa-anchu*, "Saviour of the world," (lit. "Saviour of the Land of the Living"). The preposition *n* or *en*, "of," is the only element of the title that requires any explanation. In the New Empire this *n*, in certain positions, became *na*, as in "Menophthah," which is *Mer-na-ptah*, "Beloved by Ptah." In the pyramid of *Pepa I* (Pyramid Texts, *Pepa I*, line 90), e. g., we find "*Seper na Pepa er pet*," instead of "*Se-per en Pepa er pet*." In Lower Egypt *t* was often pronounced like *th*, which, with *na*, would give us "*Saf-na-tha-pa-anchu*." In the spoken dialect,

*tha* degenerated into *the* (comp. *Ta-ânu* and *The-ânu*) so that "*Saf-na-the-pa-anech*" gave birth to *Saf-nath-pa-aneah*. The development of *nath* from *nathe*, and *nathe* from *natha*, is demonstrated by such analagous forms as Phathmetic, Phathmeht, etc. We read of the Phathmetic arm of the Nile. Now Phathmeht comes naturally enough from *Pa-ta-meht*, or *Pa-ta-cm-het*, "The Land of the North" (lit. "The Land at the Head"), and the *nath* of Sahnath differs in no respect from the *Phath* of Phathmeht. In both instances, *ta* or *tha* has been reduced to *th*. But we are now concerned with *Sa-uf*, which afterwards became *Saf*. I see in the name Joseph, the ancient Egyptian prototype *Io-sa-uf*. The *Io-nim-u*, or Ionians, are mentioned in the pyramid of *Teta* as dwelling beyond the second "great turn" (*shin-ur*) of the Mediterranean Sea ("*Uaz-ur*") in the "great circuit" of the Sea, that is, in the same locality where we find them at the opening of Grecian history. Maspero renders the name "*Hau-nibu*," which means "all the Ionians," or the Ionians collectively. The name *Io-petu*, or *Ia-petu*, that is, "the foreign *Ia*," who were settled in the north-western angle of the Delta around Rakotis (*Per-kodesu*), is the original of the well-known name, Japheth. It is interesting to note that the eight years of a deficient Nile under Soyphis correspond very closely to the seven years of a low Nile under the Pharaoh who conferred on *Io-sa-uf* the title of "*Sa-uf-na-ta-pa-anch*." The contemporary epoch-king of Soyphis was Nephhercheres of the Second Dynasty. The two reigns began at the same time, and the epoch,

3764 B. C., fell in the twentieth year of Nephercheres. The remark (ascribed to Manetho) attached to the reign of this king, in the lists, that under Nephercheres the Nile flowed with honey for eleven days, is allegorical, or symbolical, and must not be taken literally. When Maspero says: "Every prodigy, every fact related by Manetho, was taken from some document analogous to the supposed inscription of Zosiri," he, no doubt, refers to the above and to such prodigies as Menes being devoured by a hippopotamus, Achthoes being devoured by a crocodile, Osorthon being called the Egyptian Hercules, Rocchoris being burnt alive by Sabakon, etc., all of which are undoubtedly symbolical. These supposed prodigies have become such by being misunderstood and perverted. The hippopotamus of Menes, and the crocodile of Achthoes, were not at all dangerous or destructive in the literal sense, for the one merely devoured a Sothiac year, the other a Sothiac month; neither was the *rohk-ur*, or "great heat," of *Em-hir*, 724 B. C., at all injurious to Sethon, the supposed Bocchoris; for he reigned, as subject-king under the Ethiopians, for thirty-eight years after this epoch. On the contrary, such point-blank assertions are very unjust to Manetho and the native monuments translated by him. It should always be borne in mind that the lists which have come down to us, and the isolated and fragmentary notes to be found in them, were not his *work*; for we know, from the statement of Josephus, that it was a history in three books, and, as the first book ended in the seventeenth year of Amenemes I, it cer-



tainly contained a great mass of valuable information about the kings of the Old Empire, other than the meager notes preserved in the lists. The men who extracted the lists (to judge from these notes) were looking for "prodigies," and, thanks to this weakness on their part, handed down and preserved some scientific facts of great value. The most impartial witness in a case of this kind is one who is utterly oblivious to the meaning of the notices copied. If the meaning of such titles as Athothis, Kenkenes, Uennepher, Psamuthis, Amyrtaios, Rokchoris, etc., and such symbols as the crocodile, hippopotamus, lamb, etc., had been understood by the early epitomists, they would never have reached us.


### EPOCH-KINGS OF THE THIRD DYNASTY

There were but two Sothiac epochs during the three hundred and two years of the Second Dynasty, the last two hundred and fourteen of which were contemporary with the Third Dynasty, to wit: the epoch of Choiahk, 3884 B. C., and the epoch of Tybi, 3764 B. C. The first of Choiahk marked the "first appearance" (*pir-top*) of Horus above the equator, or in the northern hemisphere. At this time, according to the old notion, his body, *achet*, had attained its full growth and vigor, although his intellect was not supposed to attain its full development and perfection until the first of Phamenoth. Nether-ochis, or *Nuter-achi*, seems to be the epoch-title of the first Memphite King, for it certainly relates to this "body" of Horus.

As we have seen, the lists now give Netherochis

the twenty-eight years of his epoch-reign only, although he reigned from 3894 to 3856 B. C., or thirty-eight years altogether. His contemporary of the *The-anute* line, at Heliopolis, was *Ba-n-nuter*, that is, "Soul of God," or "Divine Soul," and it is startling to find in ancient Egypt at this time a recognition of one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity as taught and explained by Paul; that is, the doctrine that each human being, while living on this globe, has, in addition to his material body, a spiritual body and a soul, corresponding to the *achet*, *ka*, and *ba* of the ancient Egyptians. But I must reserve this important subject for some future work. Coming back to the great Step-pyramid of Sakkara, which was erected by this king to mark the epoch, 3884 B. C.—as yet it had not become the fashion for every king to build a pyramid for his last resting-place—the titles of *Nuter-achi* appear above and on either side of the doorway of the sepulchral chamber. In the center of the facing of the doorway is the symbol *zed*, sometimes written *ded*, *tat*, etc., and on either side of it the titles, "King of the South and King of the North, Lord of Diadems, *Nuter-achi*."

On the facing on each side of the doorway, repeated eight times, is the Horus-title, "*Har-Nuter-achi*." It is significant that all the titles alike are simply *Nuter-achi*, for this in itself is a positive proof that *Nuter-achi* was far more ancient than *Senoferu*, whose Horus-title was *Neb-maat*. This king held and worked the mines in the peninsula of Sinai. The Libyans, who had been reduced to submission by



Menes, took advantage of the division of the kingdom to raise the standard of revolt, but were frightened into submission by an eclipse of the sun or moon. As this remark is attached to the reign of Necherochis, it might be inferred that he also held the district lying on the west bank of the Canopic arm of the Nile; if so, Binothris was restricted to the Delta proper.

As we have seen, the division of the kingdom took place in the year 3894 B. C., after Binothris had reigned ten years, and I am now convinced (1898) that it was an amicable division made to settle a disputed succession, owing to the fact that Kaiechos died without leaving male issue. As the rights of each line derived from the daughters of Kaiechos were equal, it was, in fact, a dual kingdom, both kings assuming the throne-title, "King of the South and King of the North." Thus the reigns of Binothris and Netherochis ran parallel for thirty-eight years, and seem to end at the same time. It follows that Binothris was also an epoch-king for twenty-seven or twenty-eight years (as we have already explained, Africanus apportioned the extra months and days, which often gives rise to an *apparent* discrepancy of one year). Does the fact that the Apis-bull (symbol of the body) was venerated in Memphis, while the Mendesian-ram (*Ba-neb-ded*, identified with *ba*, "soul") was venerated in the Delta, account for the variation between *Achi-n-nuter* and *Ba-n-nuter*?

We have shown that Eratosthenes recognized the dual nature of the kingdom at this time by joining the reigns of Utnas and Toserthos, both of which

appear in the hyphenated form, "Otnoos-Toserthos," now "Ogdoos-Gosormies."

In like manner the fragment "Momcheiri Memphites" is all that now remains of Binothris-Netherochis.

The epoch of Tybi, 3764 B. C., was a most important one, for it ushered in a new season, the *P'ru-et* Season. Nephercheres of the Second Dynasty, and *Zoser-sauf* and *Zoser-teta* of the Third Dynasty, were the epoch-kings. Dividing the reign of Nephercheres at 3764 B. C., we find that nineteen years of it were before and six of it after that epoch. It is remarkable that the nineteen years of Soyphis and six years of Tosertasis exactly correspond to these. We are almost tempted to believe that *Zoser-sauf* and *Zoser-teta* of the Turin papyrus and Table of Abydos are two titles for one and the same king, whose reign of twenty-five years paralleled that of Nephercheres.

In the tomb of *Sheri* the names of *Senda* and *Per-sonu* appear. *Per-sonu*, as shown by the names of the thirty days of the lunar month, means "second appearance," and if the appearance of Horus on the first of Tybi was called his "second appearance," *Per-sonu* might be an epoch-title of Nephercheres.

The unfortunate breaks in the Turin papyrus make it impossible for me to determine whether the epoch-reigns were there entered as separate reigns. The name after Mena, the "head," seems to be *Aa-tahu-ti*; but there is a break right after his name, and the next fragment begins with Ata. The name just before *Nuter-achi* seems to be *Ka-ni-ra* (for *Ka-en-ra*),

and resembles Manetho's Che-ne-res. Was the first king of the Third Dynasty named Cheneres before he assumed the epoch-title *Nuter-achi*? If so, how comes Cheneres to be at the end of the Second Dynasty? Did the insertion of the epoch-title force him back, and does he occupy the place of *Huni*, who preceded *Senoferu*? These are questions which still await their solution. As Eratosthenes confined himself to "Theban kings," and in opposition to Manetho adopted the part of the reign *before* the epoch as his epoch-reign, we must expect to find Soyphis with nineteen years in his list.

In fact, No. 10 in the list bearing his name reads "Anoyphis," translated "Epikomos," with twenty years. Knowing that the name of this king, omitting the initial *Zoser*, was *Sa-uf-u*, which agrees literally with Manetho's So-yph-is, it is plain that Eratosthenes originally had Soyphis instead of (An)-oyphis. Thus the epoch-reigns of these two great masters, the twenty=nineteen years of Eratosthenes *before* the epoch and the six years of Manetho *after* the epoch, when brought together after an interval of more than 2,100 years, prove to a mathematical certainty that the reign of the one closed and the reign of the other commenced in the year 3764 B. C.

A strange feature about the name is, that "Epikomos" is not the translation of Soyphis, but seems to apply to *Hu-zefa* of the papyrus and Table of Sakkara, who is preceded by *Nofer-ka-Sokari* and followed by *Zazai*, *Ncbka*, and *Soyphis*. We must not forget, however, that the present list of Eratosthenes

comes to us through the hands of an unscrupulous manipulator, who did not hesitate to place Menes at

| TABLE OF<br>ABYDUS.  | TABLE OF<br>SAKKARA.                                     | MANETHO'S FOURTH<br>DYNASTY OF EIGHT<br>MEMPHITE KINGS.  | LIST OF<br>ERATOSTHENES.   | RESTORED LIST<br>OF FOURTH DYNASTY.   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| 1 Senoferu<br>2 Chufu<br>3 Ratatuf<br>4 Chafra<br>5 Menkaura<br>6 Shepseskaf | Senoferu<br>Chufu<br>Ratatuf<br>Chafra<br>.....<br>..... | Soris, 29<br>Suphis I, 63<br>Suphis II, 66<br>Mencheres, 63<br>Ratoises, 25<br>Bicheris, 22<br>Sebercheres, 7<br>Thamphthis, 9<br>Total, 284 | Saophis I, 29<br>Saophis II, 27<br>Moscheres, 31<br>Mosthes, 33<br>Rayosis, 13<br>Biyres, 10<br>Pammes, 35 | 1 Senoferu, 29<br>2 Suphis I, 29=37<br>3 Suphis II, 63<br>4 Chefres, 66=74<br>5 Mencheres, 63<br>6 Sebescheres, 35=49<br>Total, 284 |

2600 B. C. (?), and would not have hesitated (for like reasons) to suppress the true translation of *Sa-uf-u*.

## MANETHO'S FOURTH DYNASTY

There were only six kings in the Fourth Dynasty of Manetho; but their reigns covered a period of two hundred and eighty-five years, a remarkable average of forty-seven and one-half years. As Senoferu, the first king of this dynasty, commenced to reign about 3680 B. C., or thirty-six years only before the epoch of *Em-hir*, 3644 B. C., there were three epoch-reigns in this dynasty. These extra reigns, in connection with the notices attached to the reigns of the "Pyramid Builders," in order to identify them with the Cheops, Chephres, and Mencheres of Herodotus, confused the compilers and subsequent revisers of the lists, and thus led to the additions and omissions now apparent in the same. The restoration of the list—hitherto a hopeless task—has been effected by means of the assistance afforded by the Sothiac epochs and epoch-reigns.

The foregoing table, in which the lists are placed in parallel columns, will enable the reader to conveniently see where names have been omitted or inserted in Manetho's list, and why it now apparently contains eight kings, instead of six.

*Senoferu* and *Chufu* I each reigned twenty-nine years, so that the number twenty-nine appeared twice in succession in Manetho's original list. The epoch, 3644 B. C., divided the reign of *Chufu* I into two unequal parts, to wit: one of seven years before the epoch, the other of twenty-two years after it; in consequence of which the twenty-nine years of Suphis I

were dropped from the lists, and the sixty-three years of Suphis II placed opposite his name. In this way Suphis II was forced down opposite the sixty-six years of *Cha-f-ra* (Chephres), and the name of Chephres was crowded out and disappeared from the lists, so that the very existence of this distinguished epoch-king and pyramid-builder was in imminent danger of being questioned and ignored by the agnostic scientists. Mencheres was not disturbed, but his successor, *Shepseskaf*, who reigned thirty-five years altogether, twenty-five before and ten after the epoch, 3404 B. C.—received the twenty-five years before the epoch, while the remaining nine were given to Psamuthis (Phthamphthis), the epoch-title of *Shepseskaf*, which was mistaken for the name of a separate king. After this had been done, the separate reigns no longer footed up two hundred and eighty-four years, the required total of the dynasty. To correct this discrepancy some one added the fragments of *Chufu's* reign, that is, the seven years and twenty-two years, and the names of Ratoises and Bicheres, to the list, between Mencheres and Sebescheres, thereby forcing Sebescheres down to the line upon which the seven years stood. Thus Ratoises received the first twenty-five years of Shepseskaf, Bicheres the last twenty-two years of Chufu I, Shepseskaf the first seven years of Chufu I, and Psamuthis the last nine years of Shepseskaf.

Egyptologists differ as to the correct reading of the first hieroglyph in the name of the last king of this dynasty; some render it *Aseskaf*, others *Shepseskaf*.

▲     ▲


The "Pyramid Texts," however, in which this sign is written phonetically "Sheps," settle the question, and show that Manetho's "Sebescheres" is no other than *Shepseskaf*. We need not again remind the reader that in such forms as *Neb-ka-f*, *User-ka-f*, and *Shepes-ka-f*, *ra* is understood, and that Manetho rendered them *Neb-ka-ra*, *User-ka-ra*, and *Shepses-ka-ra*, as shown by Kerpheres, Usercheres, and Sebescheres.

Our list shows how the reigns of Suphis I, Chephres, and Sebescheres were divided by the epochs, 3644 B. C., 3524 B. C., and 3404 B. C.; but the reader must bear in mind that these reigns and epoch-reigns were originally made up of years, months, and days, and that they were reduced to years long after Manetho's death. In the Eighteenth Dynasty, for example, Africanus gives Amesses, the queen, twenty-one years, although her reign was actually but twenty years, seven months, and x days, and it so happened that he gave Armais five years, notwithstanding his reign did not exceed four years, one month, and x days. Thus it is possible that *Cha-f-ra* reigned but a few months over sixty-five years, and that Africanus, nevertheless, gave him sixty-six years. It is also possible that Shepseskaf was entitled to thirty-five years (twenty-six before and nine after the epoch, 3404 B. C.), although, according to the apportionment of Africanus, he seems to have but thirty-four years (twenty-five before and nine after said epoch). This view is rendered probable by the fact that Eratosthenes actually gave him thirty-five years.

The first king of this dynasty was *Senoferu*. It is

certain that he reigned over a united kingdom. We read in an old papyrus that when King *Huni* ascended to heaven, *Senoferu* arose as the beneficent ruler over the *whole land*. A part, if not all, of *Senoferu*'s claim to the throne was derived through his wife, *Mertitefs*. It seems that at this particular period of Egyptian history the crown passed in the female line. This may have been the result of the new law of succession established by King *Ba-n-nuter*. The inscriptions in the tomb of *Am-then*, who flourished just before the accession of *Senoferu*, show that a queen, '*Api-en-maat*, ruled over Lower Egypt at that time; but no such name appears in the lists of the Thinite or Memphite kings. It seems as if the Memphite kings, at this time, were restricted to Upper Egypt and the strip between it and Memphis, and that the Delta was ruled by two other separate and distinct lines.

The average length of the six reigns of the Fourth Dynasty, which was about forty-seven and one-half years, and the absence of any monuments or inscriptions indicating that the relationship of father and son existed between any of them, except *Chufu I* and *Chufu II*, compel us to assume that they reigned in the right of their wives. For instance, it appears that *Chufu I* married *Senoferu*'s widow, *Mertitefs*, which makes it probable that she was queen *in her own right*. The monuments render it certain that *Chufu* was not *Senoferu*'s son, and equally certain that *Senoferu*'s son did not succeed his father as king. The fact that these six kings actually reigned two hundred and eighty-four or two hundred and eighty-five years pre-



cludes a regular succession from father to son. Some have assumed that the crown passed to the grandsons.

The reign of *Senoferru* inaugurated a new and exceptionally brilliant chapter of Egyptian history. The country seems to have been more powerful than it was at any subsequent period. The monuments constructed under the first five kings of this dynasty are so stupendous, and at the same time so perfect in workmanship and design, that the world to-day, as 5,500 years ago, regards them with wonder and amazement. The portrait-statue of *Chufu I*, first identified by Maspero, conjures up before our astonished gaze the form and features of a monarch as grand and commanding as any that ever sat on a throne. The bright intellect and remarkable penetration of Maspero enabled him to immediately recognize the unique features of *Chufu* in this excellent statue; but this genial scholar and scientist has failed to explain to us how the "rude and savage" and "semi-barbaric" people of the preceding Thinite Dynasties were able, in an instant, to transform themselves into a highly-civilized nation capable of designing and executing such masterpieces of art. *Senoferru*, although a Memphite king, erected his pyramid at Meydum, not far from the entrance to the Fayum. It seems that the line to which *Huni* belonged had its seat in this vicinity. If, as Maspero supposes, *Senoferru* was the son of Queen *Api-en-maat*, he must have belonged to the line which ruled over the Delta, for *Am-then* certainly filled many official positions in the Delta, e. g., Xoïs, Rakotis (*Per-kodesu*)

Buto, the Saite nome, etc. *Mertitefs* may have been the queen of the southern, or Memphite, line. The Pyramid of Meydum shows that *Senoferu* established his residence in the Land of the South, or "South," as it was then called, which may have been done to emphasize his authority over the "whole land."

The inscription of Soyphis, in the Island of Sehel, indicates that he ruled over Upper Egypt to Elephantinè, which accounts for Eratosthenes calling him a "Theban king." Manetho calls Soyphis a Memphite king; hence the line to which Sethusis (*Sezos*) and Kerpheres (*Nofer-ka-ra*) belonged must also have ruled at Memphis. This makes it probable that the dividing line between the Memphite and Thinite Dynasties was between Memphis and Heliopolis and very near to Memphis. It was formerly supposed that the Pyramid of Meydum dated back to a period when these monuments were built in stages. Villiers Stuart was the first to discover that this was an error. Referring to his examination of this pyramid, he says:

"It stands on what appears to be a vast cone of quarry rubbish that rises from a plateau similar to that on which the Pyramids of Ghizeh are built. On clearing away the rubbish, we found this cone to be constructed of cut stone, and to be, in fact, the lower portion of the pyramid, which seems to have been finished only half way up, leaving the core naked. This core arises in three gigantic steps, and presents much the appearance of the fancy portraits of the Tower of Babel. The base has been used for a quarry

for ages, and is now a wreck, and buried beneath its own débris. I measured the base, and found it to be four hundred and eighty feet square, while the base of the unfinished part measured two hundred and forty feet, exactly half."

Rawlinson says:

"It was no great advance on these truncated pyramids to conceive the idea of adding to their height and solidity by the superimposition of some further stories, constructed on a similar principle, but without internal chambers. An example of this stage of construction seems to remain in the curious monument at Meidum, called by some a 'pyramid,' by others a 'tower,' of which Fig. 38 is a representation. This monument, which is emplaced upon a rocky knoll, has a square base of about two hundred feet each way, and rises out of an angle of  $74^{\circ} 10'$ , in three distinct stages, to an elevation of nearly one hundred and twenty-five feet."

The opinion voiced by Rawlinson was founded on the appearance of the upper half of the pyramid. It turns out, upon investigation, however, that the outer casing, which was built last, and generally of better stone than the core, was since quarried out and carried away. The walls of the core "are perfectly smooth, and the stones are closely fitted." Hence it was a true pyramid, and its workmanship of a high order; in fact, the worthy model of the "Great Pyramid."

Since the above was written, Petrie has advanced the theory that the primitive form of the sepulcher of Senoferu was a square mastaba, with the entrance in the lower part of the north face, and that it was after-

ward enlarged by successive coatings of masonry; that this process was repeated seven times, resulting in a compound pile, of which the top surface of each coat formed a great step on the outside; and that the last process was to add one smooth casing in one slope from base to top, and so carry it up to a point at the pyramid-angle of fourteen on eleven. He says that two of the casings have been partly removed for stones, leaving the inside mass standing in a towering form, and that it is the earliest pyramid known, as the "Step-pyramid" of Sakkara is not a true pyramid, but a *mastaba* which was repeatedly enlarged, but never coated over in one slope or finished into a pyramid like that of Medum.

As the "Step-pyramid" was built by *Nuterachi*, nearly two hundred and forty years before the Pyramid of Meydum, it is just as probable that it once had an outer casing of fine and valuable stone, which was also quarried out and removed. It is possible, though, that Senoferu, before he became king of all Egypt, had constructed a *mastaba*, which was afterwards enlarged into a pyramid; but this is pure conjecture, and the entrance-passage leading to the sepulchral chamber under the center of the pyramid does not agree with such a theory.

An astronomer who was not influenced by the various chronological schemes published by former Egyptologists, and who was ignorant of the Sothiac epochs treated of in this work, obtained approximately correct dates for the "Pyramid of Meydum" and the "Great Pyramid" by

calculations based on the angles of their entrance-passages. G. F. Hardy, astronomer royal, in an article entitled "The Date of the Fourth Egyptian Dynasty," published in the London Academy of October 29, 1892, says:

"Mr. Petrie's statement in 'Medum' as to the passage-angle of Senoferu's pyramid completes a chain of astronomical evidence proving the commencement of the Fourth Dynasty to have been very approximately 3700 B. C."

As the exact date was 3680 B. C., the coincidence is certainly remarkable. Taking a broad sweep, sufficient to cover the maximum and minimum dates of Egyptologists for the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty, he says that between 4900 and 2900 B. C. no star visible to the naked eye was within the distance from the pole indicated by the angle of the entrance-passage of the Medum Pyramid, which is  $45^\circ$ , *except the sixth magnitude star one hundred and twenty-six Piazzi*, which was so situate between 3820 and 3620 B. C., its minimum distance being about thirty-six minutes.

He finds the passage-angle of the "Great Pyramid" to be  $3^\circ 30'$  below the pole, and that of the Second Pyramid,  $3^\circ 31'$ ; the northern "trial passage" east of the Great Pyramid having the polar distance  $3^\circ 22' +$  or  $-8'$ .

"Now, at the date 3650 B. C. the star 217 Piazzi was at a distance of  $3^\circ 29'$  from the pole, increasing to  $3^\circ 34'$  by 3630 B. C. The angles of the trenches

east of the Great Pyramid give the date 3645 B. C. The dates 3645 B. C. for the trenches and external works, and 3630 B. C. for the completion of the entrance-passage, with an interval of fifteen years, accord with the probabilities of the case." (These two dates, it will be seen, were deduced independently from different stars.)

In view of the complete failures of the French and German mathematicians to derive correct dates from calculations based on the supposed "risings" of stars, the success of G. F. Hardy must be pronounced phenomenal. My discovery of the "key" to Manetho's chronology, according to which his first book closed at the end of the first historical cycle, 2784 B. C., followed by the discovery of his general chronological scheme, had enabled me to accurately fix the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty at 3680 B. C., before I happened to see Mr. Hardy's article, so that I was in a position to appreciate the importance of the results worked out by him from *data* which were undoubtedly contemporaneous with the reigns of *Senoferu* and *Chufu I*. It will be seen that *Senoferu* reigned from 3680 to 3651 B. C., and *Chufu I* from 3651 B. C. to 3622 B. C. The epoch 3644 B. C., which divided *Chufu's* reign, fell in his eighth year, and Hardy's date, 3645 B. C., for the "trenches and external works," is so near the astronomical epoch, that we are naturally amazed. It certainly required great scientific proficiency to incline the entrance-passage to the required angle. Although Mr. Hardy finds 3630 B. C. (when the star 217 Piazzi was at the distance of

---

3° 34' from the pole) to be the date indicated by the angle of the entrance-passage, it is possible that there may be a slight error in the calculation.

It is said that the entrance-passage of the Great Pyramid was so constructed that an observer stationed at the bottom of it could see the star nearest the pole. The correct angle, therefore, did not depend altogether on the calculations of the astronomers, but was checked and verified by a simple and unerring "practical test." I can not believe that the entrance-passage was *completed* as early as 3630 B. C. for the reason that Chufu II, sometimes called *Numchufu* and *Ra-tat-ef*, who became *joint-king* in 3622 B. C., certainly completed the pyramid and probably the entrance-passage also.

When Maspero says that all we know of Senoferu "is contained in one sentence: he fought against the nomads of Sinai, constructed fortresses to protect the eastern frontier of the Delta, and made for himself a tomb in the form of a pyramid," he indulges in one of those unfortunate rhetorical flourishes which have done so much to check natural and legitimate *advance* in the field of ancient Egyptian history and chronology. A volume could be written on what we know of *Senoferu*, without exhausting the subject. On the rocks of Sinai there is a representation of *Senoferu* ("Made Perfect," "Perfected") smiting the hostile *Mentiu*. His title as "King of Upper and Lower Egypt," as "Lord of Diadems," and as "Horus," was simply *Neb-maat* ("Lord of Justice"). As "Golden Horus" (*Har-nub*) his title was *Senoferu*.

Above the picture of Senoferu overthrowing the Beduin is the following: "Senoferu, servant of God, who gives strength, stability, life, health, happiness, and power, forever; subduing the foreign countries." These titles are emblematic of a high state of civilization, the reverse of what might be expected of a rude and semi-barbaric king. The crown worn by Senoferu is neither the white crown of Upper Egypt, the red crown of Lower Egypt, nor the double crown of both countries, but like the double plumes and horns worn by Amen. His costume consists of an apron, ornamented by a cordal appendage, and a collar. In his uplifted right hand is the customary stone mace usually carried by kings. Here are themes enough for the careful and patient investigator, but he must not apply to primitive man the standard of 1898 A. D. But as this work is simply a *chronological* history of ancient Egypt, further elaboration would be out of place here. I must warn the reader, however, that the "*Mentiu*" mentioned in these old inscriptions were not, as Brugsch and Maspero suppose, '*Aamu*', or Hamites, but Shemites of the purest type. The '*Aamu*', as shown by colored representations in tombs of the Nineteenth Dynasty, were *yellow* Asiatics, the Hamites of Genesis. The so-called Hyksos were '*Aamu*'. The *Mentiu* included the Beduin, Syrians, Assyrians, etc., and were more closely related to the Egyptians, who were originally Japhetic. We expect to show that the Japhetic race was the author of civilization, but that the Asiatic Hamites have always

been, as they are to-day, borrowers, corrupters, or destroyers of this primitive Japhetic civilization.

### THE CHUFUS

The traditional Cheops and the Great Pyramid have been so exhaustively described by other writers, classical and modern, that I shall limit myself to the most necessary observations only.

The latest authority, Petrie, commenting on the two tablets engraved on the rocks of Sinai, one with the name and titles of Chufu, the other with the name of Chnum-Chufu, says this raises a difficult question, to which no historian has yet given a satisfactory answer. He adds that the name of Chnum-Chufu has been found in five places, to wit, the pyramid quarry-works, the above mentioned tablet of Sinai, the quarry of *Ha-et-nub*, the tomb of "*Khemten*," at Ghizeh, and two farm names of *Shepses-ka-f-anch* in the Fifth Dynasty.

We have already seen that there were two separate Chufus, one of whom succeeded the other, and that Manetho and Eratosthenes, both eminent, careful and reliable authorities, distinguished them as Chufu I and Chufu II.

The first Chufu, the one who became the husband of Senoferu's widow, Mertitefs, reigned twenty-nine years, according to Manetho and Eratosthenes. The epoch 3644 B. C. divided his reign into two parts of seven and twenty-two years each, so that they extended from 3651 B. C. to 3644 B. C., and from 3644

B. C. to 3622 B. C. The last date coincides almost exactly with the date calculated by Hardy from the angle of the entrance-passage of the Great Pyramid. If, as I am inclined to believe, *Chnum-Chufu* was the son and heir of Chufu I and Mertitefs, he reigned *jointly* with his father for many years after 3622 B. C. In apportioning joint-reigns, Manetho usually gave to the father his sole reign only, and to the son, not only his entire reign after the death of the father, but the joint-reign also. Thus the fifty-nine years of Seti I include his long joint-reign with Ramesses I, who, therefore, has but one year and four months. The sixty-three years assigned by Manetho to Chufu II, in his chronological list, probably include the joint-reign of Chufu I and Chufu II. According to the records interpreted to Herodotus, more than one hundred and fifty years before Manetho wrote his history, Cheops reigned fifty years. If these fifty years date from the great epoch 3644 B. C., the joint-reign would cover about twenty-eight years. In the List of Eratosthenes *Chufu I* has twenty-nine years, and *Chufu II* twenty-seven. Now, as the two Chufus reigned ninety-two years, the lists may have contained some such division as the following:

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Chufu I, sole reign, before epoch, . . . . .  | 7 years |
| Chufu I, sole reign, after epoch, . . . . .   | 22 "    |
| Chufu I, joint-reign with Chufu II, . . . . . | 27 "    |
| Chufu I, sole reign, . . . . .                | 29 "    |
| Chufu I, entire reign, . . . . .              | 56 "    |
| Chufu I, entire reign, after epoch, . . . . . | 50 "    |
| Chufu II, joint-reign with Chufu I, . . . . . | 27 "    |
| Chufu II, sole reign, . . . . .               | 36 "    |
| Chufu II, entire reign, . . . . .             | 63 "    |

The Great Pyramid, which was commenced about 3644 B. C., to mark the beginning of the Sothiac month of *Em-hir*, became the joint work and joint sepulcher of the two Chufus, whose reigns were so intimately blended that in the course of time they were regarded as one king, just as Seti I and Ramesses II were under the name of Sesostris. This accounts for the double tablet of Chufu and Num-Chufu in the peninsula of Sinai, and the appearance of both names in the Great Pyramid.

We have seen that the birth of Ra, as primeval sun, was placed at the beginning of Phamenoth. Ptah in Lower Egypt and Num in Upper Egypt, as architect of the solar system, presided over the month of *Em-hir*. As Chufu I was crowned in the Sothiac month of Tybi, Num-Chufu, whose name identifies him with the month of *Em-hir*, came after Chufu. The Horus-title of the first Chufu, "*Hir*," indicating that Ra was *em hir*, that is, in his highest sign, was assumed in anticipation of the coming epoch, because Horus was not Ra, but *sa Ra*, "son of Ra."


Senoferu, as we have seen, planned his pyramid on a grand scale, the base being four hundred and eighty feet square, instead of two hundred and fifty, as formerly supposed. The site chosen for it, on the rocky knoll of Medum, was calculated to set off its proportions to the best advantage. The Great Pyramid, however, as conceived and executed by Chufu I, is of such colossal dimensions, that no structure, since erected by man, in any way approaches, much less equals, it. At Sinai we see Num-Chufu wearing the double crown

of Upper and Lower Egypt, instead of the plumes worn by his predecessor, Senoferu. Chufu I, as king of the united countries, abandoned the seat chosen by Senoferu, and the old site near Memphis, now known as Sakkara, where the pyramid of *Nuter-achi* stood towering over the Libyan Hills, for the old site opposite *Anu*, where *Atoth*, or "Kenkenes," had hewn the Great Sphinx out of the living rock, and erected, within a short distance of it, a monument in keeping with the genius and skill of those early Thinite kings, of whom it was truthfully said, thousands of years thereafter, "in those days there were giants in the earth."

The reader will pardon me for quoting the following from Petrie:

"The essential feeling of all the earliest works is a rivalry with nature. In other times buildings have been placed either before a background of hills, so as to provide a natural setting for them, or crowning some natural height. But the Egyptian consented to no such tame co-operation with natural features. He selected a range of desert hills over one hundred feet high, and then subdued it entirely, making of it a mere pedestal for pyramids, which were more than thrice as high as the native hill on which they stood. There was no shrinking from a comparison with the work of nature; on the contrary, an artificial hill was formed which shrunk its natural basis by comparison, until it seemed a mere platform for the work of man.

"This same grandeur of idea is seen in the vast masses used in construction. Man did not then regard his work as a piling together of stones, but as the erec-



tion of masses that rival those of nature. If a cell or chamber were required, each side was formed of one single stone, as at Medum. If a building were set up, it was an artificial hill, in which chambers were carved out after it was piled together; thus a mere hollow was left where the chamber should be, and then it was dressed down and sculptured as if it were in the heart of the living rock.

"The sculptor's work and the painter's show the same sentiment. They did not make a work of art to please the taste as such; but they rivaled nature as closely as possible. The form, the expression, the coloring, the glittering, transparent eye, the grave smile, are all copied as if to make an artificial man. . . . Art, as the gratification of an artificial taste and standard, was scarcely in existence; but the simplicity, the vastness, the perfection, and the beauty of the earliest works place them on a different level from all works of art and man's device in later ages. They are unique in their splendid power, which no self-conscious civilization has ever rivaled or can hope to rival; and in their enduring greatness they may last until all the feebler works of man have perished."


The same author, speaking of the workmanship of the pyramid, says:

"The entrance-passage and the casing are perhaps the finest; the flatness and squareness of the joints being extraordinary, equal to optician's work of the present day, but on a scale of acres instead of feet or yards of material. The squareness and level of the base is brilliantly true, the average error being less than a ten-thousandth of the side in equality, in squareness, and in level."

The theory often advanced in these days, that the people were oppressed and ground down by these great national works, has no foundation in fact. Everything that has come down to us from this early age points to a high civilization, in which deep religious sentiment, humanity, morality, and an innate sense of equity were national characteristics. In such communities large numbers of people can always be found who are willing to work for good wages. Stupendous works of national utility, covering a territory as large as all Europe, have been executed, in the short space of one century, by voluntary and cheerful labor in our own Republic, the freest Government under the face of the sun since the days of the "*Achiiu*" in ancient Egypt.

#### CHAFRA-CHEPHRES

This Pharaoh is now chiefly noted as the builder of the Second Pyramid. We have singled him out for the additional reason that he is a very important epoch-king. His name, *Cha-f-ra*, "The Crown of Ra," who was nearing the highest point of his course when this king ascended the throne, is quite suggestive. When *Chafra* had reigned thirty-five years, Sothis rose on the first day of Phamenoth, and Ra of the Sothiac year reached the summer solstice, called *hat*, "heart," by the Egyptians. *Chafra*, therefore, assumed the Horus-title, *User-hat*, "wielding the heart," or, as we should say, the middle of the sun's annual course. It is hard to discover what *Chafra's* epoch-title among the people was. He reigned after the epoch thirty-one years. As we have seen, Man-




etho dated his epoch-reigns from the epoch. Eratosthenes, however, took the part of the reign before the epoch as the epoch-reign. It is possible that the List of Eratosthenes originally contained nothing but epoch-kings, with the epoch-reigns, the reigns after the epochs, and the entire reigns, for example: Chephres, as "Ratoises-Heliidotus," thirty-five years; Chephres, after epoch, thirty-one years; Chephres, entire reign, sixty-six years. In the present list the numbers are confused, and the names often corrupted beyond recognition. The seventeenth Theban king is Moscheres, Heliidotus, with a reign of thirty-one years, showing that Manetho's Mencheres influenced the original name, which resembled *Ra-ta-ta-f* (Ratoises) "Gift of Ra." The eighteenth Theban king is Mosthes, without the customary translation into Greek, and, therefore, the repetition of a former name, with a reign of thirty-three years. This, however, is not so important as the epoch-title itself, and the fragments of the reign, thirty-five and thirty-one, all of which are fortunately preserved. There can be no doubt that *Ra* stood at the head of this month in the year 3524 B. C., and that such epoch-titles as "Offspring of Thoth," "Perfect One," "Gift of Ra," "Gift of Hathor," "Gift of Amen," "Gift of Bastet," etc., were in common use at this time to designate and distinguish the epoch-kings. Now, according to Manetho's chronology, *Chafra* reigned thirty-five years before, and thirty-one years after, the epoch 3524 B. C., and the List of Eratosthenes, supplying, as it does, the missing epoch-title "Heliidotus," verifies him to the year.

*Chafra* named his pyramid *Ur*, meaning "great" in the sense of old, as in "*ur-wald*," "primeval forest," and *ur-gross-vater*, "great-grandfather," because it marked the epoch of the most ancient ruler, Ra. In later times it became more and more the fashion to withdraw the knowledge of these things from the common people, and thus create an impassable intellectual gulf between them and the privileged class of the priests. Plain designations of this character were abandoned, and titles several degrees farther removed from the symbol itself were substituted; and these great pyramid-builders, who were certainly as religious as any of their successors, were brazenly characterized by the priests as despisers of the gods and desecrators of the temples, charges as false as they were preposterous, but, for this reason, all the more efficacious with the ignorant populace, which is ever ready to believe the most monstrous, unnatural, and improbable stories their crafty and selfish spiritual guides choose to invent.

#### SHEPSESKAF-SASYCHIS-ASYCHIS

The last king of this dynasty reigned thirty-five years. We have just seen that *Chafra* reigned thirty-one years after the epoch 3524 B. C. Add these thirty-one years to the sixty-three years of *Mencheres*, and we require the first twenty-six years of *Sasychis* to complete the one hundred and twenty years of the month of *Phamenoth*, leaving nine years of his reign for the month of *Pharmuthi*. This epoch-reign now appears at the end of the dynasty in the list of *Africanus* in the unintelligible form "*Thamphthis*," with



the epoch-reign of nine years. A comparison of Psamuthis and Thamphthis, as written in Greek letters, will show how easily a careless copyist could have mistaken the initial "Ps" for "Th." The second "ph," now substituted for "u," is very common before *th*, as in "Phthah," a familiar form of "Ptah." This epoch-reign, which was copied by Africanus from Manetho's work, dates from the epoch 3404 B. C., and reaches down to the close of the Fourth Dynasty, or 3395 B. C. How fortunate it is that Africanus mistook "Psamuthis" for an actual king who reigned nine years! We have already explained how *Ra*, the son of Neith, the Mother, the "Great Mother," was called *Sa-neith* or *Sa-muth*, or, with the later definite article, *P'sa-muth*, in contradistinction to *Har-sa-hus-et*, "Horus, the Son of Isis." Psamuthi is derived from Psamuth. Herodotus tells us that this king built the eastern portico to the temple of Ptah (Vulcan), "*which is by far the most beautiful and the largest; for all the porticoes have sculptured figures and an infinite variety of architecture, but this most of all.*" He also tells us that this king, "being desirous of surpassing his predecessors who were kings of Egypt, left a pyramid as a memorial, made of bricks." Agnosticism, falsely called science, disposes of such historical facts as these with a wave of the hand, although it vainly beats its head against the ponderous masses of the pyramids of Necherochis, Senoferu, the Chufus, Chephres, and Mencheres. The temples and palaces of Memphis have been swept away from the face of the earth, and the brick pyramid of Sasychis has

not yet been certainly identified; but can this alone justify us in wantonly closing our eyes to historical facts as well vouched for as the pyramids of Cheops, Chephres, and Mykerinus themselves? It is evident that the eastern portico of the Temple of Ptah in Memphis was pointed out to Herodotus about 450 B. C. He saw it, describes it, and compares it with others. It was by far the largest and most beautiful in Egypt. This must have been literally true. We now gaze in wonder at the ruins of Karnak, and unconsciously make the Temple of Amen our standard of size and beauty for the monuments and art of ancient Egypt; but we entirely overlook the fact that writers like Herodotus, who saw the Temple of Amen, *after* seeing the Great Sphinx, the Great Pyramid, the Temple of Ptah, and other monuments of Lower Egypt, either fail to mention it altogether, or do so in such general terms as leads us to believe that they were not particularly impressed by it. The Labyrinth, a work of the Twelfth Dynasty, *then intact*, but now destroyed, impressed them more than the great temples of Thebes. It stands to reason that the portico built by *Shepseskaf* exceeded those of Thebes in size, beauty, and workmanship, as much as the pyramids of Gizeh exceed the rock-cut tombs of Seti and Ramesses. There could have been no doubt as to the builder of this portico, for the sculptures with which it was covered when seen and described by Herodotus certainly proclaimed the name and titles of *Shepseskaf* to all who could read the hieroglyphs. As to the hieroglyphic writing of this period, the earlier

tombs of *Am-then* and *Mer-hat* prove that it was never again equaled in after ages.

Herodotus speaks of the brick pyramid of Sasychis as existent, and he seems to have no doubt that it actually rivaled the stone pyramids of Ghizeh in excellence of workmanship and design. Now, although *Shepseskaf* was the immediate successor of *Menkau-ra*, he did not build a stone pyramid at Ghizeh, where he could not expect to surpass the pyramids of *Chufu* and *Chafra*; but selected another and different site, where he erected his celebrated brick pyramid. Happily for science, the tomb of *Shepses-ptah* at Sakkara furnishes us with contemporary evidence of this epoch-king's reign. The inscriptions testify that *Shepses-ptah* was reared among the king's children in the palace of Mencheres. After this king's death, *Shepseskaf* took the young page into his house, where he rapidly rose in the royal favor, until the monarch "gave him the eldest of his own daughters, the princess *Maat-cha*, to be his wife. And His Majesty preferred that she should dwell with him rather than with any other man." Pharaoh esteemed him above all his servants. "He became secretary for every work that the king was pleased to execute. He charmed the heart of his lord. His Majesty allowed him to embrace his knees, and exempted him from the salutation of the ground." *Shepses-ptah* also held the office of chief steward of the storehouses, was director of the mines, prophet of *Ptah-sokari* and chief guardian of his sanctuary and chief of the priesthood of *Ptah* in Memphis.

Thus we see that *Shepseskaf* succeeded *Mencheres*, and that there were no kings between *Mencheres* and *Userkaf*, the first king of the Fifth Dynasty, bearing the names of *Ratoises*, *Bicheres*, or *Psamuthis*. Of course, after we have restored the true framework, the isolated facts can be arranged and fitted together like the separate pieces of a beautiful mosaic pavement.

FOURTH DYNASTY OF SIX KINGS

|  |           |                   |
|--|-----------|-------------------|
| 1. Senoferu, . . . . .                 | 29 years, | 3680-3651 B. C.   |
| 2. Chufu I, before epoch, . . . . .    | 7         | " 3651-3644 B. C. |
| Chufu I, after epoch, as "Me-          |           |                   |
| chiris," . . . . .                     | 22        | " 3644-3622 B. C. |
| 3. Chufu II, Chnum Chufu, . . . . .    | 63        | " 3622-3559 B. C. |
| 4. Chafra, before epoch, . . . . .     | 35        | " 3559-3524 B. C. |
| Chafra, after epoch, as "Ra-           |           |                   |
| toises," . . . . .                     | 31        | " 3524-3493 B. C. |
| 5. Men-kau-ra, . . . . .               | 63        | " 3493-3430 B. C. |
| 6. Shepseskaf, before epoch, . . . . . | 26        | " 3430-3404 B. C. |
| Shepseskaf, after epoch as             |           |                   |
| "Psamuthis," . . . . .                 | 9         | " 3404-3395 B. C. |
| Total, . . . . .                       | 285       | "                 |

EPOCH-KINGS OF THE FOURTH DYNASTY.  
(ADDENDUM, 1898)

As there were only five reigns in this dynasty, omitting Chufu I, it is evident that the three extra reigns of *Bicheris*, *Ratoises*, and *Thamphthis* must be epoch-reigns.

These titles, however, have been corrupted, and we must first endeavor to restore them. Beginning with the epoch of *Em-hir* or *Am-hir*, we shall see, when we come to the epoch 724 B. C., that Manetho introduced two equally appropriate epoch-titles for this month, to wit: "*Rokchoris*," from *Rohk-ur*,

“Great Heat;” and “Amiris” or *Am-hir-i*, from the name of the month itself. Now we find that this month was popularly known as Mechir, which would give us Mechir-i, or Mechiris, instead of Amhiris; and what is Bicheris but a slightly modified form of Mechiris? It is well known that the Greeks often converted the Egyptian “b” into “m,” and *vice versa* (comp. *Be-n-ded* and Mendes, *Nub* and Numbos, or Ombos). As Manetho’s History was written in Greek, and as the lists of Africanus were extracted therefrom, and transmitted to us by Greeks, or at least by authors using the Greek language, the two forms, Mechiris and Bechiris, may be regarded as interchangeable. The transition from BEXIPIΣ to BIXEPIΣ was easy and simple.

The title itself, in its simplicity and transparency, is characteristic of the genius of *Chufu*, who, disdaining to conceal scientific facts and great truths behind a veil of symbolical titles, preferred to let his gigantic intellect shine forth upon his people, the then civilized world, like the noonday sun, whose vicegerent on earth he was supposed to be. For this reason he was afterwards vilified by the Egyptian priests. They told Herodotus that he plunged into every kind of wickedness, shut up all the temples, and, first of all, forbade the Egyptians to offer sacrifice, and afterwards, ordered them to work for himself, etc. A remark attached to his reign in Africanus informs us that he built the Great Pyramid, and that “he became a despiser of the gods and wrote the holy book, which Africanus (speaking in the first person) tells

us he procured as a precious relic while he was in Egypt.

Eusebius, after the fashion of the theologians, attempts to improve upon the remark of Africanus, as follows: "He became a despiser of the gods, and *after he had been converted* he wrote a holy book;" adding that the Egyptians held this writing in high honor, regarding it as a precious work.

Chufu may have been a despiser of the so-called "gods," that is, the images which were worshiped by the unenlightened masses as incarnations of certain divine attributes, but he was not a despiser of God. He was, in certain respects, a reformer, and it was because he refused to play into the hands of the priests, who had already begun to hoodwink the people for their own individual gain and aggrandizement, that he brought down upon himself their implacable enmity and ill-will. In the primitive doctrine of Life, that is, "Life with God for time and eternity," the "Two Truths" were Science and Life, or, as we now express it, Wisdom and Religion. Science without Life leads to agnostic atheism; Life without Science, to superstition, physical and moral degradation, and, ultimately, intellectual death. Foreseeing the inevitable catastrophe to which the policy of the priests, in withdrawing from the common people the one truth (Science), and in giving them in the place of the other (Life) the worship of lifeless images and dumb animals, would lead, Chufu, according to L. A. Wood, caused the history of coming ages to be carved out of imperishable stone in the interior of the Great

---

Pyramid. The entrance-passage, beginning *above* the base line, which represents the dividing line between the upper and lower worlds, and descending to a point *below* the base line, leads to a horizontal passage hewn out of the living rock. This last mentioned passage leads to a chamber under the center of the pyramid, the floor of which resembles rocks heaped together in hopeless confusion, representing chaos, where there is no light, no rest, and further progress appears to be impossible. Beyond this chamber is another horizontal passage which leads to *Nothing*. Now follow Science and Life—that is, agnostic religion, or superstition, and agnostic science, or materialism—thus separated, down the stream of universal history, until you reach the dead level which leads into the impenetrable night and chaos of the Dark Ages, and you will understand the prophetic meaning of the “Chamber of the Fiery Ordeal.” But let us retrace our steps. Long before reaching the fatal base-line upon his downward course, *man* passed an ascending passage, securely sealed with immense blocks of impenetrable granite, which originally led, with ever-increasing splendor, up to the mysterious “Hall of the Two Truths,” where Science and Life sat enthroned, side by side and hand in hand. Where now, we ask, is the irrepressible conflict between true science and true religion? Modern scientists, with all their boasted skill, were not able to discover the long-lost secret of “squaring the circle.” Is it a wonder, then, that a noted scientist, when he chanced to discover that the square formed by the base of the

pyramid was equal to the circle which had for its radius the perpendicular height of the pyramid, exclaimed, in blank amazement: "The Great Pyramid has triumphed!" Are we not tempted to exclaim, "The Great Chufu has triumphed!" But another and greater surprise awaits us. Just before reaching the base-line, another passage, circumventing the impassable obstructions just mentioned, leads upward into the ascending passage, and thence into the "Great Hall of the Two Truths."

The lists, beginning at the preceding epoch of Tybi, 3764 B. C., coincide with the epoch-reign of Chufu I, as recovered from Manetho, as follows:

|  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Second Dynasty, . 3764 B. C.                 | Third Dynasty, . . 3764 B. C. |
| Nephercheres, . . . 6                        | Tosertasis, . . . . 6         |
|  |                               |
|  | 3758 B. C.                    |
| Sesochris, . . . . 48                        | Aches, . . . . . 22           |
|  |                               |
|  | 3736 B. C.                    |
| Cheneres (?), . . . 30                       | Sethosis, . . . . . 30        |
|  |                               |
|  | 3706 B. C.                    |
|  | Kerpheres, . . . . 26         |
|  |                               |
| End of Second and                            |                               |
| Third Dynasties, 3680 B. C.                  | 3680 B. C.                    |
| Senoferu, . . . . .                          | 29                            |
|  |                               |
|  | 3651 B. C.                    |
| Chufu I, before epoch of Mechir, . . . . .   | 7                             |
|  |                               |
|  | 3644 B. C.                    |
| Chufu I, as epoch-king "Mechiris," . . . . . | 22                            |
|  |                               |
|  | 3622 B. C.                    |

The epoch of Phamenoth, 3524 B. C., as we have seen, divided the reign of *Cha-f-ra* so that thirty-five years came before, and thirty-one years after, it. Neither of these fragments has survived in the list

of Africanus, but the epoch-title itself, to wit, "Ratoises," has. On the contrary, both fragments, slightly changed, still appear in the list of Eratosthenes. We refer to

- |  |          |
|--|----------|
| 17. Moscheres Heliodotus, . . . $\Delta\bar{\Lambda}$ for $\Delta E$ | 35 years |
| 18. Mosthea, . . . . . $\Delta\Gamma$ for $\Delta\bar{\Lambda}$      | 31 "     |

We can see how the list of Africanus, where Chephres has been crowded out by Suphis II, has affected these names.

Moscheres is plainly an imitation of Mencheres, while Heliodotus is a translation of *Ra-ta-ta-ef*. When we bear in mind that Phamenoth heads the third quarter of the year (scientific division), which is presided over by Ra, we can not fail to recognize the importance of the epoch-title *Ra-taios* or *Ra-tois-es*, translated Heliodotus, which is unmistakably *Ra-ta-ta-ef*, "Ra, his Gift," or "Gift of Ra" (comp. Peteathyris, Petubastis, Petechons, Petiphres, etc.)

The Table of Abydos, where *Ra-ded-ef* takes the place of Chufu II, suggests a difficult question.

Was *Ra-ded-ef*, meaning "Ra, his stability," one of the distinctive titles of Chufu II? It seems to me that the artist who engraved the table for Seti I had before him an ancient list, resembling the Turin papyrus, in which the epoch-reigns before, or after, the epoch were noted, and that he mistook the epoch-title of *Cha-f-ra*, which, as we have seen, must have been *Ra-tata-ef*, for *Ra-tat-ef*. In the list of Eratosthenes,  $\text{PATOI}\Sigma\text{I}\Sigma$  or  $\text{PATAIO}\Sigma$ , now appears as No. 13.  $\text{PAIO}\Sigma\text{I}\Sigma$ , Archikrator, with thirteen years= $\Delta E$ ,  $\Delta\Gamma$ ,  $\text{II}$ .

Here, again, Archikrator can apply only to the

primeval Ra at the summer solstice, 3524 B. C. Now note the perfect agreement of the separate reigns and epoch-reigns:

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| End of Chufu's reign (see above), . . . . .               | 3622 B. C. |
| Chufu II, . . . . .                                       | 63         |
|   | <hr/>      |
|   | 3559 B. C. |
| Chafra, before epoch, Ratoisis of Eratosthenes, . . . . . | 35         |
|   | <hr/>      |
|   | 3524 B. C. |
| Chafra, after epoch, Ratoisis of Manetho, . . . . .       | 31         |
|   | <hr/>      |
|   | 3493 B. C. |

We have said almost everything that is necessary to explain the epoch-reign of Shepseskaf. The two fragments of this reign, originally twenty-six, and nine. years, appear in Africanus, the entire reign, thirty-five years, in Eratosthenes. Reduced to years, adapted to the Sothiac epochs, the list stands thus:

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| End of Chafra's reign, . . . . .                    | 3493 B. C. |
| Mencheres, . . . . .                                | 63         |
|   | <hr/>      |
|   | 3430 B. C. |
| Sebescheres, before epoch, . . . . .                | 26         |
|   | <hr/>      |
|   | 3404 B. C. |
| Sebescheres, after epoch, as "Psamuthis," . . . . . | 9          |
|   | <hr/>      |
| End of Fourth Dynasty, . . . . .                    | 3395 B. C. |

The metamorphosis of Psamuthis into Thamphthis and Pammes may be understood by comparing them in the Greek:

Ψ Α Μ Ο Υ Θ Ι Σ  
Θ Α Μ Φ Θ Ι Σ  
Π Α Μ Μ Η Σ

Although the epoch-title, *P'sa-muth-i*, in the mutilated form "Pammes," appears in Eratosthenes, the translation "Archondes" applies to the name

Shepseskaf; for the "*Shepsu*," in my opinion, were the elders, chosen by the people, who ruled during the Golden Age of the "*Achiu*."

How fortunate it is that in the complete wreck of this portion of the list of Eratosthenes, those items which are now wanting in the Manethonian Lists have been preserved.

#### FIFTH DYNASTY OF EIGHT MEMPHITE KINGS

The present heading of this dynasty in the Lists of Africanus, "Fifth Dynasty of Eight Elephantinean Kings," is a palpable error as to Elephantinè.

After Eusebius had copied the First Dynasty, *in a manner*, he merely enumerated the remaining dynasties of Manetho's first book in the most general way, making mistakes wherever it was possible to do so. In the "Second Dynasty of Nine Kings," he names "Bochos," "Kechoos," "Biophis," refers to "three others," relates an incident under the "seventh," introduces Sesochris by name, and closes with the "ninth." In the "Third Dynasty of Eight Memphite Kings," two only are named, while the others are referred to as the "remaining six." The Fourth Dynasty is treated even more negligently. It is headed "Seventeen Memphite Kings of another regal family, of whom the *third*, Suphis, constructed the Great Pyramid, etc." Suphis II is the only king named. The seventeen kings did not belong to this dynasty at all, but he simply transcribed the total of the eight kings of the First Dynasty and the nine kings of the Second Dynasty. When he reached the

| TABLE OF<br>ASTDOR. | TABLE OF<br>SARKARA. | FIFTH DYNASTY<br>OF MANETHO. | REASONING.                  |
|---------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 User-ka-f         | User-ka-f            | Usercheres,                  | 28                          |
| 2 Sahu-ra           | Sahu-ra              | Sephres,                     | 13                          |
| 3 Kaka              | Nofer-ir-ka-ra       | Nephercheres,                | 20                          |
| 4 Ra-nofer-f        | Shepes-ka-ra         | Sisire,                      | 7                           |
| 5 Ra-n-user         | Cha-nofer-ra         | Cheres,                      | 20                          |
| 6 Men-ka-u-har      | Men-ka-u-har         | Ra-ouseres,                  | 44                          |
| 7 Tat-ka-ra         | Tat-ka-ra            | Mencheres,                   | 9                           |
| 8 Un-as             | Un-as                | Tatcheres,                   | 44                          |
|                     |                      | Onnas,                       | 33                          |
|                     |                      | Total,                       | 248 (218)                   |
|                     |                      |                              | Mytaioe-<br>Ammonodotus, 22 |
|                     |                      |                              | Petasthyres, 16             |

Fifth Dynasty his patience was well-nigh exhausted, as shown by the heading, "Fifth Dynasty of thirty-one Elephantinean Kings," "of whom the *first*, Othoes, was murdered by his guards, and the *fourth*, Phiops, held the regal dignity from the sixth to the one hundredth year of his age." The two kings who are named belong to the Sixth Dynasty. The "thirty-

one kings" are the "total" of the seventeen kings just mentioned, the six kings of the Fourth Dynasty and the eight kings of the Fifth Dynasty, which he mistook for the number of kings belonging to the Sixth Dynasty.

Thus it is easy to see how the error of Eusebius, as to Elephantinè, was carried over to the Fifth Dynasty of Africanus. The kings of the Fifth Dynasty, although of the original Thinite line of *Anu*, were Memphite, but those of the Sixth Dynasty were from Elephantinè.

There were but eight kings in Manetho's Fifth Dynasty, as still shown by the heading of Africanus, by the total of thirty-one kings copied by Eusebius, and by the Tables of Abydos and Sakkara, *although the names of nine kings now appear in the List of Africanus*. Again the notation of the epoch-reigns, of which there were two in this dynasty, is at the bottom of the seeming discrepancy.

The total of this dynasty, according to Manetho, was two hundred and forty-eight years; but as the separate reigns, including the extra ninth, now foot up two hundred and eighteen only, it is obvious that a reign of twenty-nine or thirty years has dropped out of the list. The reign which has thus disappeared, like that of Chufu I, is the epoch-reign of the king who reigned twenty-two years before, and seven years after, the epoch of Pachons, 3284 B. C., which was also the beginning of a Phoenix period. According to the Theban doctrine, *Chons*, was the son of *Amen* and *Muth*, notwithstanding, in the primitive cosmical

teachings, he was the son of *Seb* and *Nut*. The epoch-king of the month of *Chons*, therefore, could well assume the title *Amen-ir-ta-f*, literally, "Amen makes the Gift," which is the same as *Pa-ta-amen*, "The Gift of Amen." In this title, as in many others, the final *n* of Amen was completely worn off and lost in the spoken language, so that, in Manetho's time, it had softened into "Amyrtaios." Of course, "Myrtaios" is a corruption of Amyrtaios. Referring to the twenty-third Theban king in the List of Eratosthenes, we find Myrtaios "Ammonodotos," with a reign of twenty-two years. The translation into Greek, Ammonodotus, makes it certain that the original was *Amen-ir-taios* in the modified form "Amyrtaios."

Bearing in mind that the epoch-reigns of Eratosthenes *precede* the epoch, we have, following the present List of Africanus:

|   |          |            |
|---|----------|------------|
| Beginning of Fifth Dynasty (3404-10), . |          | 3394 B. C. |
| Usercheres, . . . . .                   | 28 years |            |
| Sephres, . . . . .                      | 13       | "          |
| Nephercheres, . . . . .                 | 20       | "          |
| Sisires, . . . . .                      | 7        | "          |
| Cheres, . . . . .                       | 20       | "          |
| —— (?) as Amyrtaios, . . . . .          | 22       | "          |
|   |          | <u>110</u> |
| Epoch of Pachons, . . . . .             |          | 3284 B. C. |

Thus the missing reign in Manetho's List can be supplied from the independent List of Eratosthenes, and it fills out the Sothiac month as perfectly as the corresponding part of the reign from Manetho could have done. I say "*corresponding part*," because, as we have already seen, Manetho's epoch-reigns *follow* the epochs.

In comparing the lists and tables, it is interesting to note that, as far back as the time of Seti and Ramesses, the epoch-reigns appear to have misled copyists who were not initiated and did not understand their meaning. The Table of Sakkara, for instance, places *Shepses-ka-ra*, which is identical with *Shepses-ka-f*, the epoch-king of 3404 B. C., between *Nofer-ir-ka-ra* and *Cha-nofer-ra*, the latter of whom has usurped the place of *Ra-n-user*, a very noted king.

The fact that the present list of the Fifth Dynasty contains nine reigns, where there were but eight originally, is conclusive proof that at least one epoch-title has crept in somewhere. Taking the Table of Abydos as our standard, it is not hard to discover the intruder.

The succession in the Table of Abydos is as follows:

|                     |                             |                           |          |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------|
| 1. User-ka-f, . . . | Usercheres                  | <i>User-ka-ra</i> , . . . | 28 years |
| 2. Sahu-ra, . . .   | Sephres, . . .              |                           | 13 "     |
| 3. Kaka, . . .      | Cheres                      | <i>Ka-ra</i> , . . .      | 47 "     |
| 4. Ra-nofer-f, . .  | Nephercheres                | <i>Nofer-ka-ra</i> , .    | 22 "     |
| <hr/>               |                             |                           |          |
| Ra-nofer-f, . .     | Sisires, after epoch, . . . |                           | 7 "      |

It is apparent, at the first glance, that Manetho has systematically changed the antique form *ka-f*, "his ka," or "spiritual image," into *ka-ra*, "the ka of Ra." We may, therefore, assume that he likewise changed *Ra-nofer-f*, which signifies "the perfection of Ra," into *Nofer-ka-ra*, "Perfect is the ka of Ra." *Chons*, "the moon," was symbolically termed the left "eye" of God. The name in the Table of Sakkara is written with the "eye," which I have rendered *ir*, but, to

judge from Nephhercheres of Manetho, was not pronounced. Sisires, then, seems to resolve itself into *Sa-iri*, "Son of the Eye," originally Seires, the epoch-title of *Ra-nofer-f*, after 3284 B. C.

Contemporary monuments, as arranged by Petrie, afford little additional assistance as to the successor of *Sahura*; the stone of Palermo has it Userkaf, Sahura, and Noferirkara; the Westcar papyrus, Userkaf, Sahura, and Kakau; and the List of *Ptah-cha-bau*, Sahura, Nofer-ir-kara, *Ra-nofer-f*, and *Ra-n-user*. Of these, Userkaf, Sahura, Noferirkara, *Ra-no-fer-f*, and *Ra-n-user* left pyramids, named respectively *Ueb-husut*, "Purest of Places," *Cha-ba*, "Rising of the Soul," *Ba*, "The Soul," and *Men-husut*, "Most Enduring of Places."

The second half of this dynasty presents much less difficulty. Manetho's separate numbers lead us straight to the next epoch-king, who was no other than *Uon-as*, the last king of this dynasty, now so celebrated and well-known through the inscriptions in his pyramid, recently discovered, and lately published in beautiful style under the supervision of Maspero.

Beginning at the epoch 3284 B. C., we have the following reigns:

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Epoch of <i>Pachons</i> , . . . . .                   | 3284 B. C. |
| 4. <i>Ra-nofer-f</i> , after epoch, . . . . . 7 years |            |
| 5. <i>Ra-n-user</i> , . . . . . 44                    | "          |
| 6. <i>Men-kau-har</i> , . . . . . 9                   | "          |
| 7. <i>Tat-ka-ra</i> , . . . . . 44                    | "          |
| 8. <i>Uon-as</i> , before epoch. "Peteathyris," 16    | " 120      |
| Epoch of <i>Pa-uon</i> , . . . . .                    | 3164 B. C. |

The name *Uon-as*, "Ancient One," in connection with *Pa-uoni*, is so plainly derived from the descent of the sun into the lower hemisphere, after crossing the equator on the first day of *Pa-uoni*, that it seems to be self-evident, for Ra became Osiris at the autumnal equinox. The reign of *Uon-as* before the epoch appears in the List of Eratosthenes as number thirty-one, Peteathyres, with sixteen years. The sign next below the equator, we repeat, was called *Hus-et*, or Isis, at sunset, or the autumnal equinox, and *Ha-et-har*, or Hathor, at sunrise, or the vernal equinox, whence the two fishes. Isis and Atyr are two forms of the same sign, and, therefore, interchangeable. The title *Pa-ta-hat-har*, "The Gift of Hathor," was chosen to mark this epoch more accurately than the name *Uon-as*, borne by the king during his entire reign, did. Neither the monuments nor the voluminous texts in his pyramid reveal any other name or title than *Uon-as*, which seems to be because "Ancient One" includes and merges all other titles.

As Osiris was also *Uon-nofer*, "The Perfect One," *Uon-as* called his pyramid *Nofer-hus-ut*, "The Most Perfect of Places." Petrie thinks he built a temple to Hathor at Memphis; if so, it was for the same reason that he assumed the title "Peteathyres."

It appears that King *Tat-ka-ra* also bore the name *As-as*, sometimes written Assa, which is a duplication of *As*, "Ancient," giving it augmentative force, and

meaning "Very Ancient." In the reign of this king, Ra had almost reached the end of his life in the upper hemisphere, for he was supposed to die at the autumnal equinox and enter the lower hemisphere as Tum or Osiris. This occurred but once in 1,460 years, hence *As-as* was peculiarly appropriate and descriptive.

In round numbers, *Uonas* reigned eighteen years after the epoch, and we can place the end of the Fifth Dynasty at 3146 B. C.

#### FIFTH DYNASTY OF EIGHT MEMPHITE KINGS

|                                 |          |                 |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------|
| 1. Usercheres, . . . . .        | 28 years | 3394-3366 B. C. |
| 2. Sephres, . . . . .           | 13 "     | 3366-3353 B. C. |
| 3. Cheres, . . . . .            | 47 "     | 3353-3306 B. C. |
| 4. Nephercheres, before epoch,  | 22 "     | 3306-3284 B. C. |
| Nephercheres, after epoch, .    | 7 "      | 3284-3277 B. C. |
| 5. Raouserres, . . . . .        | 44 "     | 3277-3233 B. C. |
| 6. Mencheres, . . . . .         | 9 "      | 3233-3224 B. C. |
| 7. Tatcherres, . . . . .        | 44 "     | 3224-3180 B. C. |
| 8. Ounas, before epoch, . . . . | 16 "     | 3180-3164 B. C. |
| Ounas, after epoch, . . . .     | 18 "     | 3164-3146 B. C. |
| Total, . . . . .                |          | 248 "           |

#### EPOCH-REIGNS OF THE FIFTH DYNASTY

The great epoch of Pa-chons, 3284 B. C., is an exceptionally gratifying one, for I have discovered the epoch-titles and epoch-reigns of Eratosthenes and Manetho, which give us the reigns *before*, as well as *after*, the epoch. This month, as the name indicates, was sacred to *Chons*, who was sometimes called the

son of Amen and Muth, sometimes termed the left "Eye of God." Eratosthenes, who published a Sothiac list of "Theban kings," gives us the reign of *Nofer-ka-ra* before the epoch, as Amyrtaios-Ammonodotus, with twenty-two years. Manetho, the priest of Sebennytus, gives us the reign after the epoch, as Se-iris, now Sisires, "Son of the Eye," with seven years.

Owing to the providential insertion of the epoch-reign of Se-iris in the list of Africanus, the original numbers were deranged and corrupted in such a manner that the task of restoring them seemed to be hopeless. The original total of the dynasty was two hundred and forty-eight years; but the separate numbers footed up only two hundred and eighteen. Where and how were the missing thirty years to be supplied? A comparison of the foregoing lists will show how the confusion originated. The undeniable fact that the Sothiac epochs have left their effects upon the most ancient tables and lists which have come down to us demonstrates that the Sothiac system was as old as the kingdom itself.

The epoch of *Pa-uon-i*, 3164 B. C., fell in the seventeenth year of *U'on-as*, whose name is an epoch-title in itself. Eratosthenes, substituting Hathor for Isis, uses the title, "The Gift of Hathor," or Peteathyris, which is plainly *Pa-ta-hat-har*. The sixteen years of Peteathyris, when fitted into the independent list of Manetho, verify and sustain it to a mathematical certainty.

Now, in conclusion, note how these independent numbers combine and coalesce as a harmonious whole :

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| End of Fourth Dynasty, . . . . .         | 3394 B. C. |
| 1 Usercheres, . . . . .                  | 28         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3366 B. C. |
| 2. Sefhres, . . . . .                    | 13         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3353 B. C. |
| 3. Cheres, . . . . .                     | 47         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3306 B. C. |
| 4. Nephercheres, as Amyrtaios, . . . . . | 22         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3284 B. C. |
| Nephercheres, as Se-iris, . . . . .      | 7          |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3277 B. C. |
| 5. Ra-useris, . . . . .                  | 44         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3233 B. C. |
| 6. Mencheres, . . . . .                  | 9          |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3224 B. C. |
| 7. Tancheres, . . . . .                  | 44         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3180 B. C. |
| 8. Uonas, as Peteathyris, . . . . .      | 16         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3164 B. C. |
| Uonas, after epoch, . . . . .            | 18         |
|  | <hr/>      |
| End of Fifth Dynasty, . . . . .          | 3146 B. C. |

## SIXTH DYNASTY OF SIX MEMPHITE KINGS

| TABLE OF ABYDOS. | SIXTH DYNASTY OF MEMPHIS.    | ELIOPOLITANES.          |
|------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Teta           | 1 Othoes (Tithoes), 30 years |                         |
| 2 User-ka-ra     | 2 Phioe (Phiops), 53 "       | Cho-manephtha, 11 years |
| 3 Meri-ra        | 3 Methuaphis, 7 "            | Apappu, 100 "           |
| 4 Mer-en-ra      | 4 Phiops, 100 "              | Echekrookara, 1 "       |
| 5 Nofer-ka-ra    | 5 Menthesuphis, 1 "          |                         |
| 6 Mer-en-ra      | 6 Nitocris, 12 "             | Nitocris, 6 "           |
| 7 Nuter-ka-ra    | Total, 203 "                 |                         |

## SIXTH DYNASTY OF SIX ELEPHANTINEAN KINGS

We have seen that the Fifth Dynasty was Memphite, and that the kings of the Sixth Dynasty were derived from a line located at Elephantinè; and we

have further seen how the confusion in the "headings" of these two dynasties in the lists of Africanus was brought about.

There was but one epoch in the Sixth Dynasty, to wit: the epoch of Epiphi, 3044 B. C., and, as the long reign of the epoch-king marked him so prominently that he could not be overlooked by the epitomists, the list of this dynasty has come down to us almost intact. The only material changes to be found in it affect the reign of Phiops II, and the total of the dynasty. We have shown that Phiops II, according to the remark copied by Eusebius, *reigned* from his sixth to his one hundredth year, that is, ninety-five years; but he now has the entire one hundred years of his life. The error was natural. The one hundred years of his life were substituted for the ninety-five years of his reign. The true total of this dynasty was one hundred and ninety-eight years; but, after the reign of Phiops II had been increased to one hundred years, the separate reigns footed up two hundred and three years, and the total was increased to two hundred and three years. Another circumstance favored this change from one hundred and ninety-eight to two hundred and three years. Manetho summed up frequently, and it seems had a sub-total of two hundred and three years at the close of the Seventh Dynasty, which reigned six years and "seventy days." The total of the Sixth Dynasty was, therefore, changed to two hundred and three years, and that of the Seventh Dynasty to "seventy days." In this way the grand total of Manetho's First Book, which was

2,300 years, was not disturbed. This dynasty was one of the first singled out for hostile attack by Manetho's modern opponents; but recent discoveries have demonstrated that Manetho's list was reliable and trustworthy, and that the same is supported and verified by contemporary monuments. The Pyramid Texts prove, beyond a doubt, that Manetho's work was founded on accurate historical monuments. The wonderful inscriptions discovered in the pyramids of Sakkara, which have recently been published by Maspero, have made the names of *Uon-as*, *Teta*, *Meri-ra Pepa*, *Mer-en-ra Menthu-em-sauf*, and *Nofer-ka-ra Pepa*, more familiar to the Egyptologist than the names of Seti and Ramesses. Each of these five kings has left us a pyramid and a volume of inscriptions as a lasting memorial of his life and reign!

The Fifth Dynasty came to an end about 3146 B. C., or eighteen years after the epoch 3164 B. C., according to Manetho's separate reigns and dynastic totals, and the epoch-reign "Peteathyris" of Eratosthenes. A simple addition will show that the epoch of Epiphi fell in the twelfth year of *Nofer-ka-ra Pepa*, the long-lived Phiops of Manetho.

|                                       |          |            |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Beginning of Sixth Dynasty, . . . . . |          | 3146 B. C. |
| Othoes (Tithoes), . . . . .           | 30 years |            |
| Phios (Phiops), . . . . .             | 53 "     |            |
| Menthusuphis, . . . . .               | 7 "      |            |
| Phiops II, before epoch, . . . . .    | 12 "     | 102        |
|                                       |          | <hr/>      |
|                                       |          | 3044 B. C. |
| Phiops II, after epoch, . . . . .     | 83 "     |            |
| Menthusuphis II, . . . . .            | 1 "      |            |
| Nitokris, . . . . .                   | 12 "     | 96         |
|                                       |          | <hr/>      |
| End of Old Empire, . . . . .          |          | 2948 B. C. |

Before we seek the epoch-reign of Epiphi, 3044 B. C., in the list of Eratosthenes, we must again remind the reader that the above numbers are taken from the List of Africanus, in which the extra months and days are always apportioned, and that eleven years for the reign of *Pepa II* before the epoch may be as correct as twelve.

We have already seen that Epiphi is the Greek form of *Apapi*, which was rendered "Apophis" by Manetho. *Pepa* and *Apapi*, therefore, are not the same name. The Apappus of Eratosthenes is the Greek form of *Apapi*, the epoch-title of this Phiops after 3044 B. C. The "Stela of Cheops' Daughter" shows that *Ptah* presided over the month of Epiphi in the time of the pyramid-builders; consequently, in the succeeding epoch of Epiphi, 1584 B. C., we find *Seti Mer-na-ptah*, or "Seti, Beloved by Ptah," instead of Apophis, Typhonic *Set* being substituted for *Apap*. The twenty-ninth Theban king of Eratosthenes is called "Chomaephtha," translated "Kosmos Philephaistos." He has a reign of eleven years. The translation of Chomaephtha renders the Egyptian epoch-title certain. Pharaoh claimed to rule the earth as *Ra* rules the planetary system, and the word *Cho*, or *Chu*, expresses this universal rule. Maephtha, originally Manephtha, is plainly *Mer-na-ptah*, "Beloved by Ptah," who was called Hephaistos and Vulcan. The titles Apappus and Chomanephtha, the eleven years of the epoch-reign transmitted by Eratosthenes and the separate numbers of Manetho, furnish evidence so clear and conclusive as to the exact date of

---

the accession of *Pepa II*, that no reasonable critic will question it.


No sooner do we arrive at absolute dates, showing that the Old Empire, symbolized as Adam in Genesis, came to an end, or died, 2948 B. C., than other events of equally far-reaching importance rise up and take their place in history. It was at this exact date, thus mathematically and astronomically fixed, that Thebes, as a separate and independent government, was born, and it seems to be providential that the name Noah, by which it was symbolized in the Mosaic account, is phonetically and literally identical with *No-ôa*, "Great City," the distinctive name of Thebes in the days of Moses.

We know that the kings of this dynasty reigned at the imperial capital Memphis, as their predecessors of the Fifth Dynasty had done; but we do not know, owing to the loss of Manetho's work, how a branch of the royal family, located and established in the frontier city of Elephantinè, came to obtain the crown. A happy accident has preserved and placed in our hands the head of the mummy of Menthushaphis I, the eldest son of *Meri-ra Pepa* in his old age, by his wife characterized as a "daughter of men," that is, not of the royal line. A life-like picture of it can be seen on page 435 of "The Dawn of Civilization." Maspero described the mummy as follows:

"The body is thin and slender; the head refined, and ornamented with a thick side-lock of boyhood; the features can be easily distinguished, although the lower jaw has disappeared and the pressure of the bandages has flattened the nose."

The learned author might have added that the size and harmonious proportions of the brain, the large eye, the high and broad forehead, the fine angle and delicate curve of the brow, the height from the lobe of the ear to the crown (*cha*) of the skull, and the full and esthetic curves in the regions of benevolence, veneration, and ideality stamp him unmistakably as the peer of the best examples of the modern Japhetic race. O, what a commentary on Maspero's "rude, savage, and semi-barbaric" Pharaohs of the Old Empire is this mummy and skull of Menthusuphis I! At this time, as all the authorities concede, Egyptian art and civilization was in its decadence. We shall have occasion to again refer to this king, who was but a youth wearing the side-lock when he died, when we come to examine the inscriptions of Una.

Although the published inscriptions found in the tomb of *Teta* fill a small-sized volume, and offer material which the archæologist will not exhaust in years, we know little of his life and reign, except that he was the first king of this dynasty, and was murdered by his bodyguard after he had reigned thirty years. His Horus-title was *Se-hotep-tau*, which means "giving peace to the two lands," an allusion to Ra crossing the equator, at which time he illumines the two hemispheres equally. An alabaster vase found at Abydos has the name "*Teta*, Beloved of *Ded*," with a figure of Osiris, *Ba-neb-ded* (Mendes), with a ram's head, which indicates that he ruled in the Sothiac month of *Pa-uoni*.



*Merira Pepa* was one of the most powerful kings that ever reigned over Egypt. He named his pyramid *Men-nofer*, in imitation of Menes, and during his long reign of fifty-three years built temples and monuments in all parts of Egypt. The celebrated inscription of Una casts a welcome ray of light upon his reign. This inscription adorned one of the walls of the tomb of Una in the central part of the Necropolis of Abydos. In this inscription he says he was still a youth, wearing the fillet, and employed as superintendent of the treasury under *Teta*. *Meri-ra Pepa* conferred on him the dignity of "friend" and prophet of his pyramid. After this he made him a judge, and he heard all that happened in every secret affair, executed all writings in the name of the king, and served His Majesty in most confidential relations. Pharaoh ordered him to bring a sarcophagus of white stone, with its lid and tablet in the form of a gate, from the quarries of Troia. His wisdom and zeal pleased His Majesty, who afterwards made him "sole friend" and superintendent of the irrigated lands belonging to the crown; besides this he had to keep guard behind Pharaoh, settle the royal itinerary, and arrange the order of the nobles; all of which he did to Pharaoh's satisfaction. He was intrusted with other delicate duties relating to the imperial household. When His Majesty carried war into the districts of the *Hiru-sha*, with an army of several myriads levied in the Land of the South and the Land of the North, including Negroes from the districts south of Elephantinè. His Majesty sent Una at the head of this army; he led

them to the frontier of the Delta, between the gate of *Imhotep* and the fortress of *Har-neb-maat* (the fortified line corresponding approximately to the present Suez Canal), where they formed, and marched into the country of the *Hiru-sha*. There they were completely successful, destroyed the country of this hostile nation, cut down their fig-trees and vines, burnt their houses, slaughtered their troops to the number of many myriads, and returned bringing back great numbers of living captives, for which Pharaoh praised him more than anything else. His Majesty sent Una five times to lead this army into the country of the *Hiru-sha*, on each occasion of their revolt, and he bore himself so well that the king praised him beyond everything.

It appears that there were rebels among these barbarians as far as the land of Tiba, which bordered on the sea. Una sailed in ships with his army, and attacked the coasts of this country to the *north* of the country of the *Hiru-sha*, upon which occasion he overthrew them and slew all the rebels among them. These were the acts and deeds of Una under King *Meri-ra Pepa*. The danger must have been great and imminent, which required a levy of myriads of soldiers, not only in Upper and Lower Egypt, but also in the adjoining districts of the dusky Negroes and the blue-eyed *Tamahu*. As *Meri-ra* intrusted this dangerous duty to Una, I infer that these campaigns took place near the end of his long reign of fifty-three years, when he had become too old to lead the army in person. The frontier gate of *Imhotep* was built by,

---

or named after, the second king of the Third Dynasty, and the fortress *Har-neb-maat*, as the name shows, dates from the reign of *Senoferu*. The land of the *Hiru-sha*, with its vines and fig-trees, was none other than Canaan, and it is hard to see how any Egyptologist could place it *within* the fortified frontier of the Delta (now absolutely fixed by the "Pyramid Texts") or in the *desert* south of Canaan. The people temporarily subdued in these campaigns were the Canaanites, who inhabited this country before Abraham came from Ur of the Chaldees.

After the death of *Pepa I*, *Mer-en-ra Menthu-em-sauf I*, who was quite young when he ascended the throne, advanced Una to yet higher and more responsible official positions. Una tells us that Pharaoh appointed him governor of Upper Egypt, from Elephantinè on the southern frontier to Letopolis below Memphis, "because his wisdom and zeal were pleasing to His Majesty," "because the heart of His Majesty was satisfied with him." In this office Una was above all the officers, vassals, and servants of the king in Upper Egypt, a dignity which had never been previously conferred upon a mere subject. He fulfilled the arduous duties of the new office so satisfactorily, that *Mer-en-ra* made him *second in rank to the king*, in which capacity he transacted all the business in Upper Egypt, performed the duties of superintendent of public works, and rendered judgment in all cases determined by the highest courts in Upper Egypt as second judge. We thus see that Una was a man of extraordinary abilities, equally efficient as

adviser in private affairs of the most delicate nature, as superintendent of irrigated lands, as commander of large armies in the field and on the sea, as governor of one-half of the empire, as supreme judge in hearing and determining legal controversies, and as director of those stupendous public works, the ruins of which still excite our wonder and admiration.

But all this is merely introductory to what we wish to notice particularly. After *Mer-en-ra* had dispatched *Una* to the quarries of *Abhaet*, opposite *Sehel*, to bring to the pyramid *Cha-nofer* at Memphis a royal sarcophagus and the lid therefor, and to Elephantinè to get a door with its frame, etc., of syenite, he tells us: "His Majesty sent me to *Haet-nub* (the alabaster quarries back of Tel-el-Amarna) to get a great table of offerings of alabaster from *Haet-nub*. I sent him this table in seventeen days. . . . This period (*sapet*) of seventeen days was in the third month of the *She-mou* Season (Epiphi); but as there was not sufficient water in the sluices of the canal to land safely at *Mer-en-ra's* pyramid, *Cha-nofer*, I caused it to be transported there by hand, in order to carry out the command of His Majesty, my lord." The meaning of the words, *Seth en uon-et mou hir thes-u [mer] men-a er Mer-en-ra Cha-nofer em hotep*, is clear to me, to wit: *seth*, "inasmuch," "since;" *ne uon-et*, "there was not;" *mou*, "water;" *hir-thesu*, "over the sluices;" (*mer*, "of the canal"); *men-a*, "to land;" *er*, "at;" *Cha-nofer* (the pyramid); *cheper-en-a*, "I caused it to be done;" *em*, "by;" *a*, "hand," etc. Of course,

*cheper-en-a* must be read in connection with the preceding paragraph, describing how he transported the "great table of offerings" down the river in a wide boat, built of locust wood, sixty ells long and thirty ells wide.

Menthusuphis I, who was still under age, seems to have had a premonition of impending death, and issued strict orders to have the great altar procured within a certain short period. Ordinarily the quarrying, cutting, sculpturing, and transporting of this ponderous altar would have taken so long, that when it finally arrived at the appointed spot above Sakkara there would have been sufficient water in the canals, owing to the inundation, to float it to the landing at the foot of the Libyan hills, just below the pyramid, *Cha-nofer*. Una, however, used such expedition in executing the command, that he procured the table in seventeen days, as he himself tells us, which period was in the month of Êpiphi. The waters of the Nile had not yet risen sufficiently over the sluices of the canal to float the large transport, or, as Una expresses it, to land at the pyramid in peace.

Now how does this stage of the Nile on the 18th day of Êpiphi, in the reign of *Mer-en-ra I*, tally with the chronology transmitted by Manetho, and verified by the astronomical epochs?


The end of this king's reign was one hundred and eight years after the epoch of *Pa-uoni*, 3164 B. C.; hence we can assume that Sothis rose heliacally on the 27th day of Paoni. In other words, according to

our way of reckoning, the 27th of Payni coincided with the 19th of July, consequently the 18th of Epiphi corresponded to the 9th of August.

We have seen that the annual rise of the Nile begins at Elephantinè about June 21st, and continues with fluctuating ebbs for about one hundred days, when it reaches "high-water" mark. After remaining stationary for some time, the river then commences to slowly fall. It results from this, that the inundation reaches its highest stage about September 19th. As Una's transport reached the landing above Memphis about August 9th, or fully one month and ten days before the highest stage of the Nile, it is clear that there was not yet a sufficient depth of water over the locks of the canals to enable the large transport to pass, although there was sufficient water in the Nile itself to float it down from *Haet-nub* to Memphis. The exigency which made it necessary for Una to have the ponderous stone dragged across the intervening land "by hand" must have been great and pressing indeed, and yet Una did not outlive Menthushis, for *Pepa II* is not mentioned in his inscription.

We now see how the immense stones used in the construction of the pyramids were transported to their present sites; they were conveyed to the foot of the Libyan hills in large, wide boats during the inundation, after which they were pulled up to the top of the hill over inclined roadways, as occasion required.

*Pepa I* and Una were of about the same age, and their mutual attachment continued until they were




separated by death. The reign of *Pepa I* is described as one of the most vigorous of the Old Empire. Petrie says his monuments are more numerous, and are spread over a wider area of territory, than those of any other king prior to the Twelfth Dynasty. Can it be doubted that this was owing, in a great measure, to the talents, foresight, and indefatigable energy of U'na, who was over sixty years of age when he executed the royal commands with such remarkable expedition under King *Mer-en-ra*?

*Meri-ra Pepa* had attained a ripe old age without being blessed with male issue to succeed him on the throne, when, relying on his well-established renown, he ventured to marry outside the old legitimate solar line, thereby violating a sacred, time-honored custom of the ancient Egyptians, whose devotion to their institutions Pharaoh himself could not shake. By choosing a wife from the "daughters of men," this "son of Ra" succeeded in obtaining two promising heirs, *Mer-en-ra* and *Nofer-ka-ra*, the latter of whom, it seems, was posthumous. Manetho gives Menthuthesis I a reign of seven years, according to the list of Africanus, which may have been six years and several months. As *Nofer-ka-ra* reigned from his sixth to his one hundredth year, his birth coincided very closely with his father's death. With such a powerful and adroit friend as U'na, now well advanced in years, *Mer-en-ra* had no difficulty in asserting his doubtful claim to the throne; and, after he had held the crown for over six years, the rights of his younger brother were admitted, as a matter of course. But there were,

in many districts of Egypt, powerful lords, related to the old royal line, who considered their rights to the crown superior to those of these two boys. A letter from *Nofer-ka-ra Pepa* to *Hir-chuf*, recently discovered at Elephantinè, in which the young king indulges in the most extravagant expressions of joy over the expected arrival of a "ding" or dwarf, shows on its face that he was still a mere child in the third year of his reign. This king's reign of ninety-five years, spanning, as it did, almost three generations, was the most phenomenal in the 4,000 years of Egyptian history; but the ultimate effect of it was equally disastrous. As the king grew old his grip on the reins of government grew weaker, and the hereditary nobles, who governed the more important provinces, grew more and more powerful and independent, until at last the authority of the crown in many districts, especially those most distant from Memphis, became merely nominal. Need we be surprised to find that *Pepa's* successor, *Mer-en-ra II*, probably his grandson, was forcibly dethroned and put to death by these arrogant barons after a short reign of one year and one month, and *Neit-aker-ti*, his "rosy-cheeked" sister, put on the throne in his place? They no doubt supposed that a mild and gentle queen would not interfere with their usurped rights, and that they would be permitted to rule their respective nomes unmolested by the sovereign; but they reckoned without their hostess.

Herodotus tells us that the priests enumerated from a book the names of three hundred and thirty



kings, besides Menes, of whom one was a native queen named Nitocris.

"They said that she avenged her brother, whom the Egyptians had slain while reigning over them; and after they had slain him they then delivered the kingdom to her, and she, to avenge him, destroyed many of the Egyptians by strategy; for, having caused an extensive apartment to be made under ground, she pretended that she was going to consecrate it; but in reality had another design in view; and having invited those of the Egyptians whom she knew to have been principally concerned in the murder, she gave a great banquet, and when they were feasting she let in the river upon them through a large concealed channel. This is all they related of her, except that when she had done this she threw herself into a room full of ashes, in order that she might escape punishment."

This story has been doubted by a class of writers who imagine there is real scientific merit in *denying* historical facts (otherwise well vouched for), even where they are unable to present any reasons whatever for doubting them. To disprove false relations and idle fables by actual facts is scientific; but an unsupported denial is not. The world has long since discovered that the so-called "Father of History" was eminently truthful, even though he may have been over-credulous. In this instance it appears that an account of this tragic event, which brought on the end of the Old Empire, was contained in the book, preserved among the sacred archives of a temple, in which the names, lives, and history of three hundred

and thirty-one kings of Egypt, beginning with Menes, were enumerated and set forth. The authenticity of the book shown to Herodotus by the priests is established by a fragment of the Turin papyrus, on which the name *Neit-aker-ti*, that is, "The Victorious Neith," still appears.

In conclusion, I will say that the name of the two *Mer-en-ra's* should be read *Menthu-em-sauf*, meaning "*Menthu* is his saviour," and not *Meht-em-sauf*, as now generally contended upon the authority of Lauth. The sparrow-hawk *above* the sickle of the moon reads *Menthu*. *Har* means "above," and we therefore find the term *Har* applied to the planets which are *above* the earth; but never to Venus and Mercury, which are *below* the earth. The moon partakes of a double character, because *Chons* is sometimes above and sometimes below the earth. *Menthu*, or Mars, therefore, is represented as *above Chons*; and *Har*, *above the moon*, represents *Menthu*. Although the names in the list of Africanus have been slightly corrupted (the first reading Methusuphis, the second Mentheshuphis), they point unmistakably to an original Menthushuphis; for we now know from the inscriptions that the two names were identical—the *u* in "Methu" and the *n* in "Menthe" preserve the only missing letters.

#### SEVENTH AND EIGHTH MEMPHITE DYNASTIES

Although Manetho had but ten Thinite kings with three hundred and fifty years, followed by the Memphite kings with 1,797 years, in his general scheme, he nevertheless completed the two Thinite Dynasties

with their seventeen kings and five hundred and sixty-five years, before he took up the Memphite Dynasties in his lists. In his first book he carried the Memphite Dynasties down to the beginning of the Twelfth Dynasty, 2800 B. C., cutting off the first sixteen years of Amenemes I to complete the cycle to 2784 B. C., and then introduced the Ninth and Tenth Dynasties of Heracleopolis, the five hundred and ninety-four years of which extend from 2942 B. C., the end of the Seventh Dynasty, to 2348 B. C., the date of the Hyksos invasion, or flood, when this line was extinguished. The claims of the Heracleopolite line were derived from one of the three lines which reigned contemporaneously between 3894 B. C. and 3680 B. C. After disposing of this line, Manetho takes up the new Theban line, which became the imperial, or Memphite, line after 2800 B. C. This is the key to the two periods of Egyptian history which Egyptologists have rashly pronounced hopeless. I shall here follow Manetho's arrangement, as I have found him to be a trustworthy guide.

But little can be said about the Seventh Dynasty, as it continued for the short space of but six years and seventy days. Why seventy days were used in this instance, instead of the customary two months and ten days, may have been, as proposed by Lauth, on account of the seventy days prescribed for the rites of embalming; but as all the kings were embalmed after death, and the seventy days are nowhere else mentioned, there must have been an exceptional and nationally significant reason in this case, which we

do not need to go far to find. The wholesale destruction of the nobles who had taken part in the deposition and murder of the second Menthusuphis, coupled with the death of the queen herself, was the occasion of such a mourning in Egypt that these seventy days were specially singled out and commemorated. All that remains of this dynasty in Africanus is "Seventh Dynasty of seventy Memphite kings, who reigned seventy days." In Eusebius it is "Seventh Dynasty of five Memphite kings, who reigned seventy-five days." As we have already shown, the six years have been lost from all the lists, but the number of kings in Eusebius, namely, five, was probably derived from a heading naming the first king, to wit, "X and five others."

The author of the Turin papyrus seems to have footed up at the end of the Seventh Dynasty. There is no break between Nitocris and the following five kings. Manetho also seems to have had a total of two hundred and three years, made up of the one hundred and ninety-eight years of the Sixth Dynasty and the six years and seventy days of the Seventh Dynasty. The rulers of the Thebais became independent at the end of the Sixth Dynasty.

The Eighth Dynasty, as I shall show, contrary to what we might suppose, had considerable stability, and at least one comparatively long reign. This dynasty commenced to rule at Memphis, over a territory extending but little south of the capital, in 2942 B. C., at the same time that Achthoes, the "unbearable tyrant," began to reign at Heracleopolis, near the en-

trance to the Fayum. It turns out that the first king of the Eighth Dynasty, otherwise unknown (unless his *throne-title* appears in the Table of Abydos), was an epoch-king, and, therefore, one of the most important epoch-kings in the annals of Egyptian history. If the reader will refer to the twenty-sixth Theban king in the List of Eratosthenes, he will find the epoch-title, "Semphrukrates," translated "Herakles Harpokrates," with a reign of eighteen years. This reign carries us accurately from 2942 B. C. to 2924 B. C., the epoch of *Mes-hari*, or "Birth of Horus." We have already seen that the Horus who was born in this month was called *Har-pa-krat*, "Horus, the Child," and *Sem-su*, which the Greeks rendered Herakles. Now it is perfectly evident that Eratosthenes wrote the name Sempsu-harpokrates, another instance of how his names have been disfigured. As there were but eighteen years between the beginning of the dynasty and the epoch 2924 B. C., there can be no doubt that the first king reigned at least eighteen years.

This dynasty continued one hundred and forty-two years, and seems to have had at least nine kings, showing that its end was more checkered than its beginning. These one hundred and forty-two years end at 2800 B. C., when Amenemes I, of the Theban line, obtained possession of the ancient capital, Memphis, and became the ruler over the whole land. It should be remembered that between 2948 B. C. and 2800 B. C. there was no Pharaoh in the true and strict sense of the word.

**NINTH AND TENTH DYNASTIES OF HERAKLEOPOLIS**

There is every reason to believe that the "six years and seventy days" of the Seventh Dynasty cover a period of anarchy and bloodshed. A fragment of the Turin papyrus, providentially preserved, still shows that the immediate successors of Nitocris, to the number of five or six, merely appeared upon the throne to be shortly afterwards hurled down again. The kings who did manage to get possession of the crown were not recognized as legitimate in other parts of Egypt. The local rulers of the Thebais, including a portion of Upper Egypt adjoining it on the north, asserted their independence in the year 2948 B. C., at the downfall of the Old Empire, and succeeded in maintaining it.

At the end of the Seventh Dynasty, or 2942 B. C., "Achthois," who was characterized as an unbearable tyrant, established the Ninth Dynasty at Heracleopolis, an ancient city on the west side of the Nile, a short distance above the celebrated entrance to the fertile Fayum. Thus there was a divided kingdom, the Eighth Dynasty ruling over Lower Egypt from the ancient capital, Memphis, the Ninth Dynasty, at Heracleopolis, ruling over the Heptanomis and adjoining southern districts up to Abydos, and the Eleventh Dynasty (which should have one hundred and forty-two instead of forty-three years) ruling over the rest, including the Thebais and the theretofore insignificant city of Thebes.

"Achthois," the only king of the Ninth and Tenth Dynasties mentioned by name in the lists, seems to be the monumental *Mer-ab-ra Ach-ta-i*. Egyptologists persist in writing this name "*Che-ti*," claiming that none of the hieroglyphic signs begins with a vowel. Manetho, however, knew nothing of such a rule, for he invariably represents the initial sounds in such names as Athothis, Aches, Achthois, Amenemes, Amosis, Amenophis, etc., as pure vowels.


A remark attached to the name of *Ach-ta-i*, in the lists, informs us that Egypt suffered all manner of dire calamities during his reign, which must have been a comparatively long one. We now read that he was devoured by a crocodile; but this was a palpable error on the part of the epitomist who first extracted the item from Manetho's work. The crocodile, as we have already shown, was the emblem of a Sothiac month, and was supposed to *devour the month* just as the hippopotamus was supposed to *devour the year*. It was the *hanti* of Epiphi, ending 2924 B. C., which was devoured by the crocodile, and not the tyrant Achthois. This dynasty reigned contemporaneously with the Eleventh Dynasty of Thebes, and as the future of Egypt depended upon the final issue of the wars waged by these two powerful rival lines, we shall have occasion to refer to this dynasty under the following head, where the consideration of the life-struggle between the principles symbolized by Amen and those symbolized by the crocodile of the Fayum properly belongs.

## ELEVENTH DYNASTY OF THEBES

We now come to the genesis of a new government in Egypt, which is exceptionally distinguished in the Mosaic account. We are told that Noah, who was born 2948 B. C., "was a just man, perfect in his generations," and that he "walked with God." The monuments which have survived to our times—and they are by no means so rare and insignificant as many suppose—corroborate this to its fullest extent, for they show, on their face, that the *Antefs* and *Menthuhoteps* were not only followers of the primitive teachings of Life (religion is a modern term), and raised their souls in silent worship to the Infinite One, but that, as prominently proclaimed in one of the royal shields, they were "Preachers of Righteousness."

We can not emphasize too strongly that the entire interval between the "Downfall of the Old Empire" and "Birth of the Theban Government," on the one hand, and the beginning of the Twelfth Dynasty, on the other, *was only one hundred and forty-eight years*, because modern Egyptologists, by adding together, as consecutive, the totals of the dynasties, Memphite, Theban, and Heracleopolite, have swelled it to over seven hundred and fifty (!) years, whereby they have involved themselves in hopeless darkness, uncertainty, and confusion.

The Table of Abydos contains the throne-titles—not the *names*—of twenty kings between Menthusuphis II and Amenemes I, but none of the throne-titles of the kings of the Eleventh Dynasty appears



among them, unless it be *Neb-cheru-ra* and *S'anch-ka-ra*, who seem to belong to the Sixteenth Dynasty.

But here, where we would otherwise be without a reliable guide, a kind providence has preserved for our instruction the celebrated "Table of Karnak," in which Thothmes III is represented as doing homage to his ancestors of the *Theban* line. Unfortunately, this venerable table has never been patiently studied. It was engraved and set up by order of Thothmes III, who was distinguished alike as a conqueror of foreign nations, a builder of temples and public monuments, and a patron of the arts and sciences.

The Table of Karnak is a *genealogical* list of the rulers and kings of the Theban line, introduced by a few of the leading kings of the Old Empire. It was customary in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties to *lead down* to special lists in this way; the kings selected for this purpose being generally *Mena*, *Senoferu*, *Neb-cheru-ra*, etc. Although some of the ovals are now destroyed, it is pretty certain that the introductory kings in the Table of Karnak were: 1. (Mena); 2. Senoferu; 3. Sahu-ra; 4. An; 5. Asas; 6. (Teta); 7. (Meri-ra); 8. Mer-en-ra I; 9. Nofer-ka-ra; 10. (Mer-en-ra II). The purpose of this selection seems plain enough: Menes represents the First and Second Thinite Dynasties, which ruled five hundred and sixty-five years; Senoferu represents the Fourth Dynasty, which ruled two hundred and eighty-four years; Sahu-ra, An, and Asas represent the Fifth Dynasty, which ruled two hundred and forty-eight years; and the Sixth Dynasty, to which the Theban line was

closely related (Noah was the son of Lamech), was given *in extenso* down to Nitocris.

The "hereditary prince" (not king) *Antef* follows Menthusuphis II in the genealogical line, which accounts for Lamech having one hundred and eighty-seven years before the birth of Noah—the one hundred and eighty-two years of Methusala and one hundred and eighty-seven years of Lamech seem to be transposed. This recognition in the Table of Karnak of the kings of the Sixth Dynasty, who were certainly of Upper Egyptian extraction, would indicate that the downfall of this dynasty was, in part, owing to the re-establishment, at Memphis, of the original Lower Egyptian line, and explain why the Seventh and Eighth Dynasties are again termed *Memphite*.

The first *Antef* in the Table of Karnak is not termed "king," but simply *erpa* (erbe), which is an abbreviation of *erpa-he-t*, literally "head-heir," "*erbfuerst*," or "hereditary prince." The meaning of this title is so clear that I can not see how there ever could have been any doubt about it. This "head" of the Theban line, although locally independent, was merely a provincial ruler, who still acknowledged the nominal supremacy of Queen Nitocris. Maspero gives a good representation, on page 115 of his "Dawn of Civilization," of the stela of *Antefa I*, which confirms the title of the first *Antef* in the Table of Karnak in every particular. We see the prince seated on the throne with his favorite dog by his side. The inscription, which runs from right to left, gives his title, "*Erpe he-t hir top ta en Uas*," "Hereditary prince

---

and ruler of the land of *Uas*" (Thebes); after which we read: "Gratifying the king, keeper of the gates of the South, . . . giving life to the two lands which he loves, chief of the priests, and devoted to the great God, lord of heaven, *Antefa*." The title *erpe-he-t*, coupled with the expression, "pleasing to the king," shows that the ancestor of the Theban line did not claim to be a king, but merely claimed to be the chief ruler in the Thebaid. His piety is established by the words, so rare in like inscriptions, "devoted to the great God."

The successor of this prince, in the Table of Karnak, was *Menthu-hotep I*, who is not called king, but simply "Horus." The title "Horus" was used to describe an independent ruler of the southern third of Egypt, a scion of a young line which had not yet reached its maturity. In the same section two *Antefs* follow, each bearing the title of Horus. The last oval in this section, however; that is, the one immediately in front of the figure of Thothmes III, is destroyed; but no doubt contained another Horus named *Menthu-hotep*. Thus we have a genealogical succession of five local princes, who were contemporaneous with the kings of the Heracleopolite Dynasty. The last king in the third section of the table is an Antef, carried over from the second section; but as he bears the proper name "Antef," and not the throne-title of a full-fledged Pharaoh, the designation "king" may be an error, owing to all the rest of the ovals in that section, and the following section also, being headed "king." As the names in the fourth, or lower,

section run from right to left, and as *User-en-ra*, *Necht-en-ra*, and *Se-ken-en-ra*, the last of whom engaged in war with the Hyksos, belong to the close of the Sixteenth Dynasty, it is very probable that *Nub-cheper-ra* and *Neb-cheru-ra*, whose proper names were *Antef* and *Menthuhotep*, belong to the same dynasty, as they precede the three kings just named in the Table of Karnak. It seems that the last Antef, *King Antef*, was placed immediately behind the last king of the Twelfth Dynasty, to show the descent of the Twelfth Dynasty from the Eleventh Dynasty. *Neb-cheru-ra Menthu-hotep* appears in the Table of Abydos *before the kings of the Twelfth Dynasty*; but we are still in the dark as to the series of twenty kings, in that table, to which he belongs. It is possible, yea probable, that native kings of the Hyksos period were placed *before* the Twelfth Dynasty, so that the Eighteenth might appear to immediately succeed the Twelfth Dynasty. The vacant spaces in the lower section of the Table of Karnak were given to the *last* kings of the Hyksos period, whereby *Se-ken-en-ra* was brought next to *User-tasen I* of the Twelfth Dynasty, as the following sketch will show:





TABLE OF KARNAK—LEFT HALF

| FIGURES OF THOTMES III<br>MAKING OFFERINGS. |                  | FIGURES OF THOTMES III<br>PRESENTING OFFERINGS. |                           |
|---|------------------|---|---------------------------|
| IV.   | III.             | II  | I                         |
| Usertesen I                                 |                  | .....   | (Menes)                   |
| Secken-en-ra                                | Amen-em-es I     | Anief   | Senoferu                  |
| Nech-en-ra                                  | Amen-em-es II    | An(ief)   | Sahura                    |
| Usen-en-ra                                  | .....            | Mentu(hotep)                                    | An                        |
| Nubcheper-ra                                | .....            | An(ief) erpa)                                   | Aasa                      |
| Nubcheru-ra                                 | Amen-em-es IV    |   |                           |
| Seno(er)-ka-ra                              | Sebek(noferu) Ra | Pept  |                           |
| ..... ra                                    | Anief            | Mer a ra  | Socnem-Se men-<br>(au) ra |

NOTE.—In the Twelfth Dynasty we have substituted the well-known names for the throne-names, except in the case of *Sebet noferu-ra*.

There are some ancient tombs of this period at Asyut, in which the wars for supremacy between the Theban princes and the Heracleopolite kings are incidentally mentioned.

The governors of the principality of Asyut, it seems, became very powerful and semi-independent during the latter half of the Sixth Dynasty. After the division of the empire, they espoused the cause of the kings of Heracleopolis, rendered valuable services to the new line, and in return received the title of "*hyk*," which afterwards became so celebrated in the combination *hyk-sat-u*, "ruler of foreign countries." As a mark of friendship and allegiance, the first *hyk* of Asyut assumed the name of the tyrant *Ach-ta-i*, now erroneously called Cheti (?) I. The name itself, I think, shows conclusively that these nobles belonged to this period of one hundred and forty-eight years, and not to the Thirteenth Dynasty period, when different names were fashionable. The inscriptions in these tombs, according to Maspero's latest interpretation, inform us that the governor *Ach-tai I* was brought up in the palace at Heracleopolis, and learned to swim with the royal children. On his return home he remained the personal friend of the king, and governed his domains wisely, clearing the canals, fostering agriculture, and lightening the taxes, without neglecting the army. His heavy infantry, drawn from the pick of the people of the south, were counted by thousands. He resisted the Theban claims with all his might, and his son, *Tefabā*, followed in his footsteps. "The first time," said he, "my foot-soldiers fought against the nomes of the south, which were gathered together from Elephantinè in the south to *Gau* on the north. I conquered those nomes, and drove them to the southern frontier.



I overran the left bank of the Nile in all directions. When I came to a town I threw down its walls, seized its chief, and imprisoned him at the port until he paid me ransom. As soon as I had finished with the left bank, and there were no longer found any who dare resist, I passed over to the right bank; like a swift hare I set sail for another chief. . . . I sailed by the north wind as by the east, by the south wind as by the west, and him whose ship I boarded I vanquished utterly; he was cast into the river, his boats fled to shore, his soldiers were as bulls upon whom the lion falleth; I compassed his city from end to end, I seized his goods and cast them into the fire." He further informs us that he "extinguished the rebellion by the counsel, and according to the tactics, of *Up-uay-t*, lord of Asyut." From this time "no district of the desert was safe from his terrors;" he "carried flame at his pleasure among the nomes of the south." He administered such strict justice that evil-doers disappeared as if by magic. "When night came, he who slept on the roads blessed me, because he was as safe as in his own house; for the fear which was shed abroad by my soldiers protected him; and the cattle of the fields were as safe there as in the stable; the thief had become an abomination to the god, and he no longer oppressed the serf, so that the latter ceased to complain, and paid the exact dues of his land for love of me."

In the time of the second *hyk*, bearing the name of *Achtai*, the son of *Tefaba*, and grandson of the first *Achtai*, the authority of the kings of Heracleopolis

had become very weak; for the people of this city drove out the king *Meri-kara*, who was obliged to take refuge in Asyut with his friend, the powerful *hyk Ahtai*. This noble gathered together an extensive fleet, which encumbered the Nile from one end of the Terebinth nome to the other. If we may believe *Ahtai*, the rebels united with the Thebans in vain; he "sowed terror over the world, and himself alone chastised the nomes of the south." As he descended the Nile to restore *Meri-ka-ra* to his capital, "the sky grew serene, and the whole country rallied around him; the commanders of the south and the archons of Heracleopolis trembled when the royal uræus, ruler of the world, came to suppress crime; the earth trembled, the south took ship and fled, all men fled in dismay, the towns surrendered, and fear took hold on their members."

When *Meri-ka-ra* came to Heracleopolis "the people ran forth to meet him, rejoicing in their lord; women and men together, old men as well as children." But the temporary success thus chronicled was more apparent than real. The Thebans returned in greater force, and the kings of Heracleopolis succumbed before the superior virtue of the southern line. The line of Heracleopolis was not extinguished, but continued on as a local, subordinate line under the Twelfth Dynasty, and during the period of the divided kingdom which followed it, until it disappeared in the general wreck of the Hyksos Flood.

I think the overthrow of Heracleopolis by Thebes occurred about one hundred and nine years after

2942 B. C., which accounts for Eusebius giving the Ninth Dynasty one hundred (one hundred and nine) years, and the Eleventh Dynasty forty-three (thirty-three) years, for both these numbers appear to be derived from Manetho's work.

The four hundred and eighty-five years of the Tenth Dynasty represent a *period* such as the three hundred and fifty years of the Thinite kings, the four hundred and fifty-three years of the Theban kings, and the five hundred and eleven years of the Hyksos denomination—all derived from Manetho's work. We have seen that the total number of kings in the main line to the beginning of the Seventh Dynasty was thirty-seven. The six kings of the Seventh Dynasty increase this total to forty-three kings. Now it is significant that the nine kings of the Eighth Dynasty and the six rulers of the Eleventh Dynasty, who were contemporary for one hundred and forty-two years, give us the required total of ninety-two kings.

While on this subject, an opinion advanced by Petrie claims our attention. This learned writer seeks to identify *U'ser-en-ra*, who follows *Nub-cheper-ra* (Antef) in the lower section of the left half of the Table of Karnak, with the Hyksos king, *Chi-an*. Naville discovered the lower portion of a sitting statue of *Cha-i-an* at Bubastis. The name was first read *Ra-ian*; but turns out to be "*Se-user-en-ra Cha-i-an*," as plainly shown by scarabs and cylinders bearing his name. This king styled himself "*hyk-sat-u*," as well as "King of Upper and Lower Egypt," which stamps him unmistakably as a hyksos-king; and Petrie's

theory that he belonged to the period between the Sixth and Twelfth Dynasties falls to the ground. Manetho evidently found no documents or monuments placing hyksos-kings in this period, for all will admit that the dynasties of Memphis, Heracleopolis, and Thebes, assigned by him to this period, were native Egyptians, and not Hamites. The style and workmanship of the statue itself resembles that of the monuments dating from the end of the Thirteenth Dynasty. In the Table of Karnak, *User-en-ra*, which may be the same as *Se-user-en-ra*, appears immediately *before Necht-en-ra*, who precedes *Se-ken-en-ra*, both of whom belong to the close of the Sixteenth Dynasty and Hyksos period. It is probable that intermarriages took place between the families of the Sixteenth Theban and Seventeenth Hyksos Dynasties, for Manetho described the two lines as "Hyksos and Theban kings," and, therefore, as ruling jointly. *Cha-i-an* may have been a common ancestor to both lines, which would explain his appearance in the table, or *User-en-ra* may have been the contemporary Theban king to *Se-user-en-ra Cha-i-an*.

*Necht-en-ra* appears on a libation-table, now at Marseilles, in company with *Se-ken-en-ra Ta-ôa-ken*, under whom the ship-captain Aahmes was born. The right half of the Table of Karnak contains the throne-titles of thirty Theban kings belonging to the Thirteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Dynasties of Manetho; but as there was no room for the last seven kings of the Sixteenth Dynasty in this half of the table, they were disposed of in the lower section of

the left half. Thus there were thirty-eight kings, in a genealogical succession, between the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties, a period of over seven hundred and fifty years, making the average reign about twenty years. Manetho had fifty-nine kings during the same period. This is the key to the long list of Theban "ancestors," to wit, fifty-one, specially honored by Thothmes III in the Table of Karnak.

We have already called attention to the fact that one of the kings of this dynasty, *Antef-ôa*, bore the title "preacher of righteousness," and we might add that this was his *Horus-title*, and also an integral part of his titles as *king* inclosed in the royal shield. The monuments show that the rulers of this dynasty were just and perfect in their generations, devoted to God, and "proclaimers of righteousness;" but it would carry me beyond the scope of this work to attempt to give the evidence in detail.

In conclusion, we wish to call attention to the following from Josephus: "Now Lamech, when he had governed seven hundred and seventy-seven (one hundred and eighty-seven) years, appointed Noah, his son, to be ruler of the people, who was born to Lamech when he was one hundred and eighty-two (one hundred and eighty-seven) years old, and retained the government nine hundred and fifty years."

The evolution of these "governments" into individuals was a slow and gradual process, which had not been fully completed when Josephus wrote his *Antiquities of the Jews*. It seems that the text consulted by Josephus then showed that Noah was not

derived regularly from the preceding government; but was *appointed* "to be ruler of the people." Now there is every reason to believe that the first *Antef* derived his title in this way, that Pharaoh *appointed* him ruler over the Thebaid towards the close of the Sixth Dynasty. The nine hundred and fifty years during which Noah "retained the government," date from his birth (2948 B. C.). According to Manetho, there were only eight hundred and fifty years between the birth of the Theban Government and the beginning of the Hyksos Dynasty (Mizraim), hence these nine hundred and fifty years necessarily include the first one hundred years of the contemporary Sixteenth Theban Dynasty. Was it for this reason that the two hundred and fifty-one years of the bogus Seventeenth Dynasty were changed to one hundred and fifty-one?

Speaking of the Flood, Josephus says: "This calamity happened in the six hundredth year of Noah's government, in the second month, called by the Macedonians *Dius*, but by the Hebrews *Marchesuan*; for so did they order their year in Egypt."

Here again we see that Noah was originally the name of a government, which had existed six hundred years when the Flood swept over the land, and we need but attach the Egyptian dates to those of Genesis, or *vice versa*, to arrive at the exact date of the Hyksos Invasion, as verified by the astronomical epochs. The phrase, "for so did they order their year in Egypt," shows that the text used by Josephus originally recognized Egypt as the land governed by Noah and overwhelmed by the Flood.

## ELEVENTH DYNASTY, FROM TABLE OF KARNAK

1. *Erpe het* Antefa, "ruler of the land of Thebes."
2. *Har* Menthu-hotep I (*Neb-ho-tep*, *Sa-ra-Menthu-hotep* in shields below title of king).
3. *Har* Antef I (*Har*, *Uah-anch*, King and *Sa-ra*, *Antef*, not inclosed).
4. *Har* Antef II *da* (Horus, *Up-ut-maat*, King *Ra-seshes Upet-maat*, *Sa-ra*, *Antef-da*, all in separate shields).
5. *Har* Menthu-hotep II (Horus *Neb-tau*, Lord of Diadems *Neb-tau*, *Nub-nutern*, King *Ra-neb-tau*, *Sa-ra Mentuhotep*).
6. King Antef III (*King Ra-seshes Hir-maat*, *Suten-Antef*).

The key to the correct succession of the six *Antefs* and *Menthuhoteps*, shown on the Table of Karnak, is to be found in the titles assumed by them to mark their rank and official dignity. There is a rapid progression from the "*Erpe het*" of the first, to the "King" of the last, for King Antef was not only King *Ra-seshes Hir-maat*, but was *Suten* (King) Antef, instead of *Sa-ra* Antef, which may account for his title as king being Antef instead of *Ra-seshes Hir-maat* in the table.

We have already had occasion to notice the first Antefa, who was appointed ruler (*hir-top*) of the people of the land of "*U'as*." All the rest, except the last, are termed Horus, not King, which was intended to describe independent rulers of the Thebaid. Their titles on their monuments, however, show a rapid advance in power and dignity, culminating in Antef III, who styles himself "King Antef" instead of "*Sa-ra* Antef."

The last one called Horus, presumably Mentuhotep II, is specially honored in the Table, like Mena, Amenemes I, and Usertasen I, by being placed immediately in front of the figure of Thothmes III, indicating that he enjoyed the reputation of being the greatest ruler of the dynasty. It will be seen that he assumed the titles of royalty; but the honor itself was reserved for his successor (King Antef).

On the monuments, *Antef-ôa* has the Horus-title *Upet-maat*, "Preacher of Righteousness," and the throne-title, *Ra-seshes upet-maat*. King Antef patterned his throne-title after this, for it reads, "*Ra-seshes hir-maat*," showing that Antef the Great had earned his distinctive title in the opinion of his successor, King Antef. It was logical to let a new dynasty follow the reign of the Theban ruler, who had extended his authority over the whole land, and could be crowned as Pharaoh in the ancient capital of Memphis.

We feel confident that we have placed Mentuhotep II, who bore the title *Neb-tau-i*, "Lord of the two Lands," in his correct position, for the additional reason that a *Hib-sed* or "Sed-festival" was celebrated in the second year of his reign, which, therefore, corresponded to the year 2864 B. C., giving us eighty-three years for the reigns of his three predecessors, and sixty-five years for the reigns of himself and King Antef—a natural and probable division of the period of one hundred and forty-eight years between the five rulers who succeeded the local prince Antef.

We have identified the first Horus, *Mentuhotep I*,

with the ruler of the same name bearing the additional title, *Neb-hotep*, "Lord of Peace," because this title, together with *Sa-ra* itself, is inclosed in the shield containing his name, showing the first step towards the regal dignity. The title, "Lord of Peace," was suggested by the Sothiac month of Messori, "Birth of Horus." The child of Isis and Osiris (like *Chons*, the child of *Amen* and *Muth*) was regarded as the bringer of peace, and styled the "Peace-loving."

Antef I, whose Horus-title was *Uah-anch*, "Mansion of Life," also inclosed *Sa-ra* in the shield containing his name, *Antef*, placing the bee and plant, symbolizing "King of Upper and Lower Egypt," directly above the shield. The funerary stela found in his tomb, which was a small brick pyramid, built on the west side of the Nile opposite Thebes, contains a representation of this king and his four pet dogs, showing that he inherited his grandfather's hobby, and, in this respect at least, was a worthy scion of the "ancestor" of the line. The inscription on this tablet still remaining—for the upper portion of it is destroyed—inform us that Horus *Uah-anch*, *Antef* captured Abydos, and opened its prisons, built temples, dug canals, benefited his city, and (what was equally important in a *new line*) left the succession to his son. The inscription further informs us that the tablet was set up in the fiftieth year of his reign.

The tomb of this king is the *first* mentioned in the report of the commission appointed by Ramesses X to examine the royal tombs at Thebes, which has come down to us in the papyrus known as the "Ab-

bott papyrus." It was situated "north of the later temple of *Amen-hotep* of the Terrace," and had been injured by thieves at a point opposite the spot where the tablet stood; but the thieves had not been successful in penetrating to the sepulchral chamber. The mummy was found to be untouched. I contend that the Table of Karnak contains a genealogical list of the Theban rulers, from the beginning of the Sixth Dynasty down to the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty, and necessarily excludes all rulers not in the direct line of descent. Now, as *Erpe-het* Antefa succeeds *Mer-en-ra II*, we can assume that the downfall of the Old Empire occurred near the beginning of the reign of Menthu-hotep I. The beginning of the reign of Antef *Uah-anch*, therefore, can be placed at circa 2910 B. C. The conquest of Abydos proves that he was a brave and warlike prince. As he reigned fifty years, we can place his death at circa 2860 B. C. A funerary stela, now in the museum of Leyden, is dated in the thirty-third year of *User-tasen I*, or about 2750 B. C., and informs us that the great-grandfather of the deceased was appointed to the office of scribe in the nome of Abydos in the reign of Horus *Uah-anch*, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, son of Ra, *Antef*—*Sa-ra* being inclosed in the same shield with the name *Antef*. This shows that this *Antef* exercised sovereignty over the nome of Abydos, and corroborates the prince's statement, that he had "captured Abydos and opened its prisons."

We must interpret such phrases as "*th'ru rik en Har Uah-anch*" with the aid of the German and Saxon

languages, for the Egyptian language was Japhetic, not Semitic; compare Saxon, *through*; German, *durch*; and Lower German, *rik*; Danish, *rig*; German, *reich*.

Now, as to the chronology deducible from the four generations represented by the *atefen atef en atef-a*, "the father of the father of my father," of the inscription, who flourished as scribe in the nome of Abydos during the reign of Antef I. The four generations in the peaceful office of scribe average one hundred and thirty-three years, which reach back from 2750 B. C. to 2883 B. C., or about the middle of his reign, showing that facts, however derived, always agree with the true chronology.

In conclusion, it may not be out of place to say a word or two about *Nub-cheper-ra* Antef and *Nubcheru-ra* Mentuhotep, who have been, heretofore, assigned to the Eleventh Dynasty. In the Table of Karnak these kings immediately precede three kings who undoubtedly belong to the close of the Sixteenth Dynasty of Thebes, which was contemporaneous with the Seventeenth Dynasty of Hyksos kings. Steindorff calls attention to a fact which indicates that these two kings did not precede but *followed* the Twelfth Dynasty. We have just seen that none of the kings of the Eleventh Dynasty had different titles as Horus and as Lord of Diadems; in fact, Usertasen II seems to have been the first to adopt different titles for each of these. Now the Horus-title of *Nub-cheper-ra* was *Nofer-cheperu*, while his title as Lord of Diadems was *Hir-nest-f*, "Upon his throne," which would seem to relegate him to the Sixteenth Dynasty,

notwithstanding his name Antef. But it so happens that *Neb-cheru-ra* had the same title for both, to wit, *Sam-taui*, "Uniter of the two Lands," which would seem to place him before the Twelfth Dynasty, and discredit the arrangement in the Table of Karnak. Fortunately, a small fragment of the Turin papyrus, No. 63, which contains two names in succession, comes to our assistance in this perplexity. As reproduced by Lepsius in his Book of Kings, it contains the names *Neb-cheru-ra* and *Se-user-en-ra*, the last of which was the throne-title of the Theban and Hyksos king, *Chi-an*. But even here there is a discrepancy between the papyrus and the Table of Karnak, which is hard to explain, as *Nub-cheper-ra* follows *Neb-cheru-ra* in the latter.

The Theban kings of the Sixteenth Dynasty were tributary to the Hyksos kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty. Manetho grouped them together as joint lines, making the total (259+259) five hundred and eighteen years. The division of the kingdom seems to have been complete at the beginning of these dynasties, 2097 B. C.; but rivalries, complications, and conflicts arose in the course of time. A spirit of freedom grew up in the south, coupled with the desire to drive the hated Hamites out of the Delta. This spirit induced the kings to assume the names of the illustrious princes of the Eleventh Dynasty, who had re-established the empire after its downfall, and given to Egypt the glorious dynasty of the Amenemhets and Usertasens. The names of Antef and Menthuhotep were calculated to arouse the slum-

▲     ▲     ▲     ▲     ▲

bering patriotism of the people, and prepare them for the impending conflict. We need not, therefore, be surprised to find the predecessors of *Sekenenra* bearing the names of Antef and Menthuhotep. The tombs of the Sixteenth Dynasty succeeded those of the Eleventh Dynasty at Thebes, and the architecture of the two was so much alike that Champollion and other early Egyptologists were led to believe that the one followed immediately after the other. It was simply a renaissance of national feeling, which was visible in architecture as well as science and literature.

The Turin papyrus seems to have had but six kings in the Eleventh Dynasty. The sixteen kings in the Manethonian Lists may be taken from the sixteen years of Amenemes I, immediately following it.

#### **CHU-MER-NA-PTAH AND SEM-SU HAR-PA-CHRAT**

The reader has seen how the two above-named epoch-reigns, which are taken from the List of Eratosthenes, elucidate, confirm, and verify the lists derived from the great work of Manetho. Strange as it may appear, we have recovered the entire twelve epoch-reigns of Manetho's first Sothiac cycle, and every one of these reigns sustains, and is sustained by, Manetho's chronological scheme, as unfolded in his general scheme, his dynastic totals, and his separate reigns. The fact that quite a number of these are derived from Eratosthenes, who pursued a different method from Manetho, demonstrates to a certainty that Manetho did not invent the system or divide the

reigns to agree with it. Such a complete agreement of two rival systems all along the line, for a period of 1,460 years, is unparalleled in ancient history, and there is nothing to compare to it except the celebrated Canon of Ptolemy, which was the work of one chronologist, and stands alone.

Resuming the Sothiac list at the end of the Fifth Dynasty, or 3146 B. C., where we left off, we have, to the beginning of the Second Cycle, 2784 B. C., the following items:

|   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| End of Fifth Dynasty, . . . . .                                 | 3146 B. C.        |
| Tithoes, . . . . .  | 30                |
|   | <u>3116 B. C.</u> |
| Phiops I (Meri-ra), . . . . .                                   | 53                |
|   | <u>3063 B. C.</u> |
| Menthusuphis I, . . . . .                                       | 7                 |
|   | <u>3056 B. C.</u> |
| Phiops II, as epoch-king "Chomanephthah," . . .                 | 12                |
|   | <u>3044 B. C.</u> |
| Phiops II, after epoch of Epiphi, 3044 B. C., . .               | 83                |
|   | <u>2961 B. C.</u> |
| Menthusuphis II (1 yr. 1 m.), . . . . .                         | 1                 |
|   | <u>2960 B. C.</u> |
| Nitokris, . . . . .   | 12                |
|   | <u>2948 B. C.</u> |
| End of Old Empire, and Birth of No-ah, . . .                    | 6                 |
| Seventh Dynasty, Memphite, . . . . .                            |                   |
|   | <u>2942 B. C.</u> |
| Eighth Dynasty, epoch-king "Sempsu Harpo-<br>krates," . . . . . | 18                |
|   | <u>2924 B. C.</u> |
| Epoch of Mesore, . . . . .                                      | 124               |
| Eighth Dynasty, after epoch (142-18), . . . . .                 |                   |
|   | <u>2800 B. C.</u> |
| Amenemes I, before Second Cycle, . . . . .                      | 16                |
|   | <u>2784 B. C.</u> |

Manetho separated the first sixteen years of the reign of Amenemes I, and placed them in his first book and first cycle. The List of Eratosthenes shows upon its face that this great scientist originally entered these identical sixteen years as an epoch-reign under the title "Petethothis;" that is, *Pa-ta-tahu-ti*, "The Gift of Thoth," to distinguish it from the preceding title Athothis. It was natural and convenient for the unknown arranger of the present list to confound Pete-athyris and Petethothis, both of whom had sixteen years; and he accordingly substituted Pete-athyris for Petethothis at the head of the Twelfth Dynasty.

I think I have sufficiently explained the epoch-titles "Kosmos Philephaistos" and "Herakles Harpokrates," and their applicability to the months of Epiphi and Mesore, and I can merely add that a closer study of the inscriptions in the pyramids of Unas and others has satisfied me that all these terms, without exception, were not only in common use, but were very ancient *at that time*.

### THE GRAND TOTALS OF NINETY-SIX KINGS AND 2,121 YEARS OF MANETHO'S SECOND BOOK

There were fifty-two kings belonging to the main line in Manetho's First Book, exclusive of Amenemes I. The total of ninety-two kings for the First Book included the nineteen kings of the Tenth Dynasty of Heracleopolites, who reigned four hundred

and eighty-five years from 2833 B. C. to 2348 B. C. The five kings of the Ninth Dynasty of Heracleopolis reigned one hundred and nine years from 2942 B. C. to 2833 B. C., when the dynasty was overthrown by the Thebans. A branch of this line established itself at Xoïs, or Sebennytus, in the heart of the Delta, and maintained itself there for four hundred and eighty-five years, and until it was overwhelmed and destroyed by the Hyksos Flood. Manetho allowed the Sothiac Era 2784 B. C. to divide his main line; but, having introduced the Tenth Dynasty of Heracleopolites in his First Book, he carried the side line down to its close. It seems that he mentioned the Heracleopolite kings in his Second Book, where they appeared as the Fourteenth Dynasty of Xoïs and Sebennytus, reigning side by side with the Thirteenth Dynasty of Thebans for two hundred and forty-two years.

The two hundred and forty-two years of the Thirteenth Dynasty and the two hundred and forty-two years of the Fourteenth Dynasty gave rise to a sub-total of four hundred and eighty-four years, which was almost equivalent to the four hundred and eighty-five years of the Tenth Dynasty. Now as the two hundred and forty-two years of the Fourteenth Dynasty, and its kings also, were already included in the totals of Manetho's First Book; that is, the ninety-two kings and 2,300 years; they were not again computed in the totals of his Second Book. Bearing this in mind, we find that Manetho had ninety-six kings in his Second Book, as follows:

---

|  | No. of Kings | Total. |
|--|--------------|--------|
| From First Book, main line, . . . . .      |              | 52     |
| Twelfth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . .    | 8            | 60     |
| Thirteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . . | 16           | 76     |
| Fifteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . .  | 11           |        |
| Sixteenth Dynasty, Theban, . . . . .       | 32           | 43     |
| Seventeenth Dynasty, Hyksos, . . . . .     | 6            |        |
| Eighteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . . | 16           |        |
| Nineteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . . | 7            |        |
| Total, . . . . .                           |              | 96     |

According to the list of Africanus, which is the most reliable (barring subsequent changes), there were ninety-six kings in Manetho's Second Book, in addition to the ninety-two kings of his First Book.

Eusebius has only ninety-two kings, owing to the fact that he reduced the Eighteenth Dynasty to fourteen kings, and the Nineteenth Dynasty to five kings. By a strange freak of chance, the Thirteenth Dynasty now has sixty kings, the total including the eight kings of the Twelfth Dynasty; and the Fourteenth Dynasty now has seventy-six kings, the total including the sixteen kings of the Thirteenth Dynasty. Manetho, following the ancient registers, summed up at the end of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Dynasties; that is, at 2348 B. C., the date of the great *'Aamu* Flood. Down to this date there were seventy-six kings in the main line and thirty-nine kings in the side lines, or altogether one hundred and fifteen kings. After the Hyksos invasion he began a new computation of the kings, beginning with the Fifteenth Dynasty of Thebans. Thus there was no total at the end of this dynasty which the redactors of the lists could mistake for the actual number belonging

to the same. Originally, the Fifteenth Dynasty had eleven kings, the Sixteenth Dynasty thirty-two kings; but the Seventeenth Dynasty, instead of the six kings actually assigned to it, received the total of forty-three kings, which appeared at the end of the Sixteenth Dynasty. It would be interesting to know whether this systematic substitution of running totals for the actual numbers was the result of carelessness, or whether it was intentionally done to confuse, mystify, and discredit the lists.

It is certain that the otherwise truthful list of Africanus has been changed in several respects, in order to make it agree with certain false notions published by Josephus. For example, the Hyksos Dynasty, originally the Seventeenth, has been substituted for the Fifteenth, which was originally Diospolitan. The unavoidable effect of this arbitrary substitution was to completely disarrange and confuse the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Dynasties. But as these changes affected the number of years as well as the number of kings, we will take up the total of 2,121 years before examining them in detail.

I contend that Manetho's original total for his Second Book was only 1,721 years, made up as follows:

|   |              |       |
|---|--------------|-------|
| Twelfth Dynasty, Diospolitan, after 2784 B. C., . | 194          | years |
| Thirteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . .        | 242          | "     |
| Fifteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . .         | 251          | "     |
| Sixteenth Dynasty, Theban, . . . . .              | 260          | "     |
| Seventeenth Dynasty, Hyksos, . . . . .            | 260          | "     |
| Eighteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, including        |              |       |
| thirteen years of Chebros, . . . . .              | 276          | "     |
| Nineteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . .        | 238          | "     |
| Total, . . . . .                                  | <u>1,721</u> | "     |

The Fourteenth Dynasty of Xoïs is omitted in the above computation for the reason just given, to wit: that its two hundred and forty-two years are included in the 2,300 years of the First Book. According to Africanus and both versions of Eusebius, however, there were 2,121 years in Manetho's Second Book. How can this apparent discrepancy be explained?

Manetho computed the entire period of Theban supremacy, from the accession of Amenemes I, 2800 B. C., to the Hyksos Invasion, 2348 B. C., at four hundred and fifty-three years, as follows:

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Twelfth Dynasty (16 + 194=), . . . . . | 210 years |
| Thirteenth Dynasty, . . . . .          | 242 "     |
|  | <hr/>     |
| Total, . . . . .                       | 453 "     |

This total now appears as the total of the Thirteenth Dynasty.

Again, Manetho had an "Egyptian total" of four hundred and eighty-four years for the combined Thirteenth and Fourteenth Dynasties. It seems strange to us that two dynasties, reigning side by side for two hundred and forty-two years, should be summed up as (242+242) four hundred and eighty-four years; but this was done for mathematical purposes only; that is, to serve as a check upon the separate numbers, etc. This total now appears as the total of the Fourteenth Dynasty. Manetho also had an "Egyptian total" of five hundred and eighteen or five hundred and twenty years for the combined Sixteenth and Seventeenth Dynasties, which were contemporary. After the Hyksos had been placed in the Fifteenth

Dynasty this total was given to the Sixteenth Dynasty, and the two hundred and fifty-one years of the Fifteenth Dynasty were reduced to one hundred and fifty-one, and given to the Seventeenth Dynasty. The following numbers foot up 2,121:

|   |       |       |
|---|-------|-------|
| Twelfth Dynasty, original number, . . . . .   | 194   | years |
| Thirteenth and Fourteenth Dynasties, total, . | 484   | "     |
| Fifteenth Dynasty, as changed, . . . . .      | 260   | "     |
| Sixteenth Dynasty, as changed, . . . . .      | 518   | "     |
| Seventeenth Dynasty, as changed, . . . . .    | 151   | "     |
| Eighteenth Dynasty, including thirteen years  |       |       |
| of Chebros, . . . . .                         | 276   | "     |
| Nineteenth Dynasty, . . . . .                 | 238   | "     |
|   |       | <hr/> |
| . Total, . . . . .                            | 2,121 | "     |

Manetho's main line, Diospolitan and Theban, was made up as follows:

|  |       |       |
|--|-------|-------|
| Twelfth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . .    | 194   | years |
| Thirteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . . | 242   | "     |
| Fifteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . .  | 251   | "     |
| Sixteenth Dynasty, Thebaid, . . . . .      | 260   | "     |
| Epoch-reign of Chebros, . . . . .          | 13    | "     |
| Eighteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . . | 263   | "     |
| Nineteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . . | 238   | "     |
|  |       | <hr/> |
| Total, . . . . .                           | 1,461 | "     |

These numbers can be accepted as accurate; they fill out the cycle of 1,460 fixed years between the eras 2784 B. C. and 1324 B. C., and are supported by the epochs and epoch-reigns.

The early Christian chronographers were simple enough to believe that the serpent-worshiping Hyksos were the Hebrews, and that their forcible expul-

sion from Egypt by Chebros, or Amosis, in the year 1837 B. C., was, in fact, the peaceable exodus of the Hebrews, which took place in the year 1491 B. C. But as their great authority (Josephus) had fixed the Exodus at 1648 B. C., they attempted to change the Manethonian Lists so as to bring the expulsion of the Hyksos down from 1837 B. C. to 1648 B. C., and thereby blotted out one hundred and eighty-nine years of history. Now let us see how this change was effected. In the Twentieth Dynasty there was a king called Phuoro or Nile. This king was reigning in Egypt when Troy was captured. Eratosthenes fixed the Fall of Troy at 1181 B. C., and King Nile, according to Manetho, reigned from 1207 B. C. to 1168 B. C. The last reign of the Nineteenth Dynasty was Tho-uris; that is, *Ta-ur-et*, with seven years. These seven years extended from 1331 B. C. to 1324 B. C., the celebrated era of Menophres. It so happened that Tho-uris and Phuoro looked very much alike in Greek, and one of these early chronographers conceived the design of confounding the two. Phuoro was disposed of by removing the seven kings of the Twentieth Dynasty to the pseudo-Sothis List, where they were placed immediately before the Hyksos kings, and by transferring the remark attached to the reign of Phuoro to Tho-uris, which title was changed to Thuoris, making it appear that Thuoris was called Polybus by Homer, and that Troy was captured during his short reign of seven years. This necessarily brought Thuoris down from 1331 B. C. to 1181 B. C., and gave the forger one hundred and fifty of the re-

quired one hundred and eighty-nine years. In consequence of this unprecedented rape, the Twentieth Dynasty is now a perfect blank in all the lists. Although the list of Africanus has been changed to conform to these false dates, there is abundant evidence that the changes were not made by him. Observe how the numbers were made to fit into the scheme:

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Assumed date of Expulsion, . . . . .           | 1648 B. C. |
| Eighteenth Dynasty, true number, . . . . .     | 263        |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1385 B. C. |
| Nineteenth Dynasty, as changed from 238, . . . | 204        |
|  | <hr/>      |
| Fall of Troy, . . . . .                        | 1181 B. C. |

It is significant that the twenty-five years of Amosis *after* the epoch 1824 B. C., and the false one hundred and fifty-one years of the Seventeenth Dynasty, carry us back to that epoch.

The pseudo-Sothis List places Menes, or Mestraim (?), “the first king,” at 2724 B. C., which was the assumed date of the “Dispersion,” five hundred and thirty-four years after the Flood. Thuoris, the fifty-ninth king in the false list, is placed at 1181 B. C., and I infer from this that the above changes in the list of Africanus were made by the author of the so-called pseudo-Sothis List.

Eusebius noticed that something was wrong, and made an attempt to correct the errors; but did not succeed. We know from his great *Chronicon* that he placed the beginning of his Eighteenth Dynasty at 1723 B. C., which was one hundred and one years after the actual date; but he was completely deceived

by the remark attached to the reign of Thuoris, and, therefore, left him at 1181 B. C.

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Beginning of Eighteenth Dynasty, . . . . . | 1723 B. C. |
| Eighteenth Dynasty, . . . . .              | 348        |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1375 B. C. |
| Nineteenth Dynasty, . . . . .              | 194        |
|  | <hr/>      |
| Fall of Troy, . . . . .                    | 1181 B. C. |

When we come to Manetho's Third Book we shall see how the numbers of the Twentieth, Twenty-first, Twenty-second, Twenty-third, Twenty-fourth, and Twenty-fifth Dynasties were reduced so as to make them foot up six hundred and fifty-six years, the exact number required to fill out the interval between 1181 B. C. and 525 B. C., the well-known beginning point of the Persian Dynasty—the true number being seven hundred and ninety-nine years. In the scheme of Eusebius, it is also significant that the one hundred and three years of his false Seventeenth Dynasty approximately fill out the interval between the epoch 1824 B. C. and 1723 B. C. In order to understand the numbers of Eusebius, we must go back to the artificial list called the "Old Chronicle," from which he seems to have derived them. The Second Cycle was filled out in the Old Chronicle, as follows:

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Twelfth Dynasty, from Eusebius, . . . . . | 182 years |
| Fifteenth Dynasty, . . . . .              | 443 "     |
| Sixteenth Dynasty, . . . . .              | 190 "     |
| Seventeenth Dynasty, . . . . .            | 103 "     |
| Eighteenth Dynasty, . . . . .             | 348 "     |
| Nineteenth Dynasty, . . . . .             | 194 "     |
|   | <hr/>     |
| Total, . . . . .                          | 1,460 "   |

It is remarkable how long the learned world has been deceived by these numbers, each of which is evidently false and artificial. The men who were unscrupulous enough to devise and successfully carry out such a scheme, did not hesitate to lay their hands upon other equally venerable documents.

The List of Africanus still contains upon its face evidences of the violent changes referred to. The Sixteenth Dynasty (originally Theban) is now headed "Thirty-two Other Shepherd-kings;" but the number of kings (thirty-two) and the final total (five hundred and eighteen) do not belong to the Hyksos. The Seventeenth Dynasty is now headed "Forty-three Other Shepherd-kings and Forty-three Thebaid, Diospolitan Kings." These forty-three kings are the eleven Diospolitan kings of the Fifteenth Dynasty, and the thirty-two local kings of the Thebais of the Sixteenth Dynasty, who ruled contemporaneously with the six Hyksos kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty. The thirteen years of Amosis between 1837 B. C., or the Expulsion of the Hyksos, and the great epoch of Pachons, 1824 B. C., were given to Chebros, a title which will be explained in its proper place; but as far back as Josephus we find this reign inserted *after* the twenty-five years and four months of Amosis, and Africanus seems to have placed the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty at the end of his reign, or about 1798 B. C., which accounts for his 1,020 years to the first Olympiad (776 B. C.).

After the end of Manetho's Second Book had been

fixed at 1181 B. C. there were just 1,603 years in a direct line from the era 2784 B. C. to this date, and the extra five hundred and eighteen years supposed to be due to the forty-three (?) Shepherd-kings made the grand total 2,121 years. Could this be owing to chance alone?

TABLE OF TWELFTH DYNASTY  
ACCORDING TO BRUGSCH

|   |          |       |
|---|----------|-------|
| 1. Amenemes I, alone, . . . . .           | 20 years |       |
| Amenemes I, with Usertasen I, . . . . .   | 10       | "     |
| 2. Usertasen I, alone, . . . . .          | 32       | "     |
| Usertasen I, with Amenemes II, . . . . .  | 3        | "     |
| 3. Amenemes II, alone, . . . . .          | 29       | "     |
| Amenemes II, with Usertasen II, . . . . . | 6        | "     |
| 4. Usertasen II, alone, . . . . .         | 13       | "     |
| 5. Usertasen III, . . . . .               | 26       | "     |
| 6. Amenemes III, . . . . .                | 42       | "     |
| 7. Amenemes IV, . . . . .                 | 9        | "     |
| 8. Skemiophris, . . . . .                 | 4        | "     |
|   |          | <hr/> |
| Total, . . . . .                          | 194      | "     |

CORRECT TABLE

|  |          |       |
|--|----------|-------|
| 1. Amenemes I, before cycle, 2784 B. C., . . . | 16 years |       |
| Amenemes I, after cycle, 2784 B. C., . . .     | 13 years | } 46  |
| 2. Usertasen I, alone, . . . . .               | 33       |       |
| Usertasen I, with Amenemes II, . . . . .       | 3        | } 38  |
| 3. Amenemes II, alone, . . . . .               | 29       |       |
| Amenemes II, with Usertasen II, . . . . .      | 6        | } 55  |
| 4. Usertasen II, alone, . . . . .              | 17       |       |
| 5. Usertasen III, . . . . .                    | 38       |       |
| 6. Amenemes III, . . . . .                     | 42       | "     |
| 7. Amenemes IV, . . . . .                      | 9        | "     |
| 8. Sebku-noferu, . . . . .                     | 4        | "     |
|  |          | <hr/> |
| Total, . . . . .                               | 194      | "     |

**TWELFTH DYNASTY OF EIGHT THEBAN KINGS**

The accession of the Twelfth Dynasty, after the last king of the Eleventh Dynasty had extended his authority over Lower Egypt, inaugurated one of the most brilliant periods of Egyptian history, commonly known as the Middle Empire. Monuments, which are rare under the Eleventh Dynasty, except in Upper Egypt, become plentiful in all parts of the land, from Elephantinè in the south to the marshes of the north. The lists again give the names of the kings and their reigns, although the present lists are badly corrupted.

The first sixteen years of the first king, Amenemes I, belong to Manetho's first Sothiac Cycle; and the Twelfth Dynasty, as now constituted, begins at the era 2784 B. C.; consequently the last thirteen years only of the reign of Amenemes I belong here. As this king reigned jointly with his son, Usertasen I, during the last ten years of his reign, Manetho, in his chronological list, assigned the entire thirteen years to Usertasen I, giving him forty-six years altogether. These forty-six years, however, do not include the joint-reign of Usertasen I and his son, Amenemes II, which Manetho gave to the latter.

The list ascribed to Eratosthenes closes with the Twelfth Dynasty, at the head of which we now find "Peteathyres" with an epoch-reign of sixteen years. Here Peteathyres was substituted for "Petethothis" (*Pa-ta-thoth*), "The Gift of Thoth," because each had an epoch-reign of sixteen years, and the author of the present artificial list, in which Menes, "the first king,"

was placed at 2724 B. C., wanted to get rid of the troublesome period of 1,520 years between 4244 B. C. and 2724 B. C.

The reigns of Usertasen II and Usertasen III have been changed in Manetho's lists, owing, perhaps, to a late attempt to identify them with Sesostris; but we are able to now restore them with the greatest accuracy from the list of Eratosthenes. These kings reigned jointly, like their predecessors, for many years, for which reason Eratosthenes added the two reigns together. No. 34 of his list now reads, "Ses-tosichermes 'Erakles Krataios," fifty-five years. It seems almost incredible that a name could have been mangled to this extent by intelligent writers. In the first place, the name was "Usertosis" (comp. *Toser-tosis* and *Usercheres*). In the second place, there was no translation of the name, for it had just appeared in the list. In the third place, the explanatory remark was "Ermes e 'Erackles Krataios," which constitutes one of the most gratifying proofs of the Sothiac system to be found in the lists. As we shall see, this reign of fifty-five years, beginning in the Sothiac month of Thoth, extended over into the succeeding month of Paophi. Bearing in mind that Pharaoh claimed to rule over the world like Ra, and that Ra passed through all the stages of life, from birth and infancy to old age and death, it will be easy to understand how Usertosis reigned *first* as Hermes, or Thoth, and afterwards as Herakles, or *Pa-api*, whose symbol was the reclining sphinx. But a greater surprise still awaits us. When Eratosthenes described

the first nineteen years of the reign of Usertasen III as “Herakles Krataios,” he followed the symbols used in the Old Empire; but when he came to the epoch-reign itself, he substituted the symbol used in the New Empire. No. 37 of his list is “Phuoro,” translated “Nile,” with a reign of nineteen years. Paophi and *Pa-iar* (Phuoro) are both names of the Nile, and in this instance the meaning is beyond dispute. Of course, the epoch-reign of Usertasen III extends from the beginning of his reign to the epoch of Paophi, 2664 B. C., so that we are enabled to fix the dates accurately, and also restore the separate reigns, which are lost. The following table will show how it can be done:

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Beginning of era, . . . . .                    | 2784 B. C. |
| Usertosis I, including thirteen years of Amen- |            |
| emes I, . . . . .                              | 46         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 2738 B. C. |
| Amenemes II, . . . . .                         | 38         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 2700 B. C. |
| Usertosis II, . . . . .                        | 17         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3683 B. C. |
| Usertosis III, as epoch-king Phuoro, . . . . . | 19         |
|  | <hr/>      |
| Epoch of Paophi, . . . . .                     | 3664 B. C. |
| Usertosis III, after epoch, . . . . .          | 19         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3645 B. C. |
| Amenemes III, . . . . .                        | 42         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3603 B. C. |
| Amenemes IV, . . . . .                         | 9          |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3594 B. C. |
| <i>Sebek-noferu</i> , . . . . .                | 4          |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 3590 B. C. |



We have used Manetho's numbers, fitted to the era, for the reigns of Usertasen I and Amenemes II, to wit, forty-six and thirty-eight, and yet the agreement with the numbers derived from Eratosthenes is perfect. We have seen that he estimated the combined reigns of Usertasen II and Usertasen III at fifty-five years, and the seventeen years of the former and thirty-eight years of the latter give us this exact sum.

The forty-eight years of the supposed Sesostris, in Manetho's lists, were the thirty-eight years of Usertasen III, afterwards increased to forty-eight years, when Usertasen II disappeared from the lists.

The duration of the dynasty, regardless of its division by the era 2784 B. C., was two hundred and ten years. A fragment of the Turin papyrus, supposed to belong to this dynasty, shows a total of two hundred and thirteen years, one month, and seventeen days, which is slightly in excess of the above total; but it may include a joint-reign, excluded by Manetho, or three years of Amenemes I, before he became the recognized Pharaoh of the whole land, Manetho having given one hundred and forty-two years to the Eighth Dynasty of Memphis, which brought his chronology down to 2800 B. C.

The history of this dynasty is so well known, and has been so fully described from the monuments by Brugsch, Maspero, and Petrie, that it would be outside the scope of this work to repeat it here, our object being to shed light upon the dark passages of ancient Egyptian history and chronology.

During the last fifty or sixty years of the Sixth Dynasty, the power of the feudal lords was greatly increased, and during the period of wars and anarchy between 2948 B. C. and 2801 B. C. it reached its fullest development. The valley of the Nile fairly bristled with the castles of these powerful barons. We have just seen how one of the kings of the Ninth Dynasty of Heracleopolis was compelled to seek protection at the hands of one of these feudal lords, who had become so powerful that he was able to raise and equip an army and fleet of sufficient strength to quell the rebellion against the king, and replace him on his throne at Heracleopolis. One of the chief difficulties the princes of the Eleventh Dynasty—the just and righteous Antefs and Mentuhoteps—had to encounter in their efforts to re-establish the empire, was the opposition and hereditary rights and privileges of these feudal lords. Writing of the accession of *Amen-m-het I*, Maspero says, “Such a state of affairs could only be reformed by revolution,” and seems to think it doubtful whether this king usurped the crown or inherited it legitimately. There is no reason to doubt that the Twelfth Dynasty was simply a continuation of the Eleventh Dynasty. One of my initial discoveries, which was of great service to me in ferreting out the contemporary dynasties, was that Manetho, with one exception, gave the names and reigns of the kings of the dynasties which ruled over the entire land; but gave the general heading and total duration only of the dynasties which ruled over parts of Egypt only. When the Eighth Dynasty of

Memphis came to an end, and Amenemes I became a true Pharaoh, ruling over the entire land, a new dynasty began according to Egyptian notions, and this is what is meant by Manetho's Twelfth Dynasty. Of course, Amenemes I arose like *Tum* himself, restoring what he found in ruins, re-establishing the boundaries of the nomes, expelling or removing troublesome, obstreperous, or rebellious lords, and appointing loyal subjects in their places, and generally reorganizing the empire on a firm and stable basis. In his instructions to his son, Usertasen, he admonishes him to live in harmony with his subjects, and not to rely solely on the rich and noble—good counsel culled from the sad experience of former kings.

Besides the throne-title, *Sc-hotep-ab-ra*, already mentioned, this king assumed the remarkable title, *Nem-mestu*, "Re-born."

Petrie, who renders this title "renewing births," supposes that it was a motto symbolizing the re-institution of the living organization of everything in the country; but it has a deeper and more significant meaning. As the "living Horus," the vicegerent of Ra on earth, this king was "re-born" at the winter solstice of the Sothiac year 2784 B. C., and the title expresses this new birth as *Har-pa-krat* as plainly as words can express anything. As the centuries rolled by, Seti I, the great epoch-king Osiropis of Epiphi, 1584 B. C., assumed this title *Nem-mestu* to mark his second birth into the new Sothiac month, thereby attaching to this subordinate event the same importance that Amenemes I did to the great era itself.

It has been the fashion to accuse Manetho of stupidly computing the joint-reigns to both kings, and thereby swelling his chronological numbers, so that no reliance could be placed in them. This dynasty, which abounded in joint-reigns, was supposed to furnish indisputable evidence to sustain this charge; but it proves the exact reverse of what it was expected to prove; and I trust that this little work will forever silence the false clamor.

This dynasty, although Theban, was imperial, and had its chief residence at the old capital, Memphis, and built its tombs and pyramids in that vicinity; but Thebes seems to have been a second capital of the empire, as it certainly was the capital of the South. We shall see that the succeeding Thirteenth Dynasty, which is also termed Theban in the Manethonian list, had its chief capital at Memphis, as shown by the 1,797 years of the Memphite kings, which continue on down to the end of the Fifteenth Dynasty, the Fourteenth Dynasty of Xoïs being contemporary with the Thirteenth. In proof of the assertion that the Table of Karnak was a genealogical list of the Theban kings down to the Eighteenth Dynasty, I refer to this dynasty, where one of the kings was omitted. We find: 1. Amenemes I; 2. Usertosis I; 3. Amenemes II; 4. Destroyed; 5. Destroyed; 6. Amenemes IV; 7. *Seb-ku-noferu-ra*. We know that Usertosis II, Usertosis III, and Amenemes III, all three distinguished kings with long reigns, came between Amenemes II and Amenemes IV; hence it is evident that one of these has been omitted in the Table of Karnak.

As Amenemes III reigned forty-two years after the long reign of Usertosis III, we are forced to assume that the two successive Usertasens were brothers, and that one of them was not in the direct line of descent. In the Thirteenth Dynasty, where the reigns were comparatively short, we find as many as three or four omitted at a time.

The last name, *Seb-ku-nofer-u-ra*, suggests a difficulty which is hard to explain, for the reason that the last ruler in Manetho's list, Skemiophris, is termed the "sister" of Amenemes IV. But we must not forget that Manetho always gives the proper name, while the Table of Karnak, after the Eleventh Dynasty, invariably gives the throne-title. Amenemes IV and his sister devoted themselves, with great energy, to the completion of the Labyrinth in the Fayum, the most colossal building ever erected in Egypt. Its ruins show that it was one thousand feet long by eight hundred feet wide; and it is probable that *Sebek-noferu-ra*, a younger son of Mares, was appointed ruler of Thebes, and that when the kingdom was divided, twelve years after Mares' death, he dated his regnal years, as *Theban king*, from *that* time.

#### INTERVAL BETWEEN THE TWELFTH AND EIGHTEENTH DYNASTIES

The Twelfth Dynasty came to a close, as we have just seen, about 2590 B. C. The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Dynasties begin at this date, and run side by side, for two hundred and forty-two years, to the Hyksos Invasion, 2348 B. C. The Hyksos were expelled from Egypt five hundred and eleven years after

the invasion; that is, 1837 B. C. The entire period, therefore, from the Twelfth Dynasty to the Hyksos Expulsion, covers exactly seven hundred and fifty-three years. This period was filled out as follows:

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Close of the Twelfth Dynasty, . . . . .                                   | 2590 B. C. |
| Thirteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, and Fourteenth Dynasty, Xoite, . . . . . | 242        |
| Hamite Flood, . . . . .   | 2348 B. C. |
| Fifteenth Dynasty, Diospolitan, . . . . .                                 | 251        |
|   | 2097 B. C. |
| Sixteenth Dynasty, Thebaid, and Seventeenth Dynasty, Hyksos, . . . . .    | 260        |
| Hyksos Expulsion, . . . . .   | 1837 B. C. |
| Aahmes, as Chebros, . . . . .   | 13         |
| Epoch of Pachons, . . . . .   | 1824 B. C. |

Thus it will be seen that the Hyksos Invasion took place two hundred and forty-two years after the end of the Twelfth Dynasty; not eighty-seven years, as supposed by Bunsen, or nine hundred and thirty-seven years, as supposed by Petrie.

Manetho's summation at the end of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Dynasties gave him:

1. A total of seventy-six kings, excluding the Fourteenth Dynasty (which did not belong to the main line), to wit,  $52+8+16=76$ .

2. A total of four hundred and fifty-three years for the Diospolitan line, made up as follows:

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Amenemes I, before 2784 B. C., . . . . .          | 16 years |
| Twelfth Dynasty, after 2784 B. C., . . . . .      | 194 "    |
| Thirteenth Dynasty, to Hyksos Invasion, . . . . . | 242 "    |
| Total, . . . . .                                  | 453 "    |

The one hundred and forty-eight years of the Eleventh Dynasty could not be included in this total, because the one hundred and forty-eight years of the Seventh and Eighth Dynasties, covering the same period, had been computed in the main line.

3. An "Egyptian total" of four hundred and eighty-four years, being the sum of the two hundred and forty-two years of the Thirteenth Dynasty and the two hundred and forty-two years of the Fourteenth Dynasty.

In the present lists these grand-totals, by mistake, appear as the totals of separate dynasties. We now find:

Thirteenth Dynasty of sixty Diospolitan kings, who reigned 453 years.

Fourteenth Dynasty of seventy-six Xoite kings, who reigned 484 years.

These errors have been the innocent cause of much confusion; for instance, Petrie, the latest writer on the subject, makes an earnest effort to find one hundred and thirty-six kings, where there were actually but sixteen, and account for nine hundred and thirty-seven years, where there were actually but two hundred and forty-two; but, as they have preserved intact to this day these invaluable grand-totals, science is indebted to them for evidence of the best possible character in a period where it was badly needed.

After the Hyksos Invasion, a native dynasty of eleven kings, called "Diospolitan," reigned two hundred and fifty-one years. It will be remembered that,

after his "ten Thinite kings," who reigned from 4244 B. C. to 3894 B. C., Manetho had (seventy-seven) "Memphite kings," who reigned 1,797 years; that is, from 3894 B. C. to 2097 B. C. The sum given to the "Memphite kings" includes the two hundred and forty-two years of the Thirteenth Dynasty and the two hundred and fifty-one years of the Fifteenth Dynasty; hence I confidently assume that both of these dynasties held Memphis, the ancient capital. It is true that this fact can not be harmonized with certain popular theories regarding the condition of Egypt during the first two hundred and fifty-one years of Hyksos suzerainty; but theories must always yield to facts.

After the Fifteenth Dynasty had governed Egypt two hundred and fifty-one years in the name of the 'Aamu kings, the great "kings of kings" in distant Elam, an 'Aamu dynasty was established in Egypt, the kings of which reigned over Egypt as Pharaohs, with their capital at Memphis. The Sixteenth Dynasty of native kings, or "hyks," was restricted to the Thebaid, and was tributary to the Hyksos Pharaohs. Thus the Hyksos-kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty and the Theban kings of the Sixteenth Dynasty reigned contemporaneously for two hundred and fifty-nine years and ten months, from 2097 B. C. to 1837 B. C., when the foreign intruders were driven out of Egypt.

Manetho called the Sixteenth Dynasty "Thebaid," to distinguish it from the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Dynasties, which he called "Diospolitan." The head-

ing of the Seventeenth Dynasty, in the list of Africanus, which now reads, "Forty-three other Shepherd-kings and Forty-three Theban Diospolitan-kings (followed by "together the Shepherds and the Thebans reigned one hundred and fifty-one [five hundred and eighteen] years,") is a blending of former totals, influenced by the fact that the dynasty was originally Hyksos.

It is now clear that Manetho had:

1. Sixteenth Dynasty of thirty-two Thebaid kings, reigned two hundred and fifty-nine years and ten months.

2. Total of Theban and Diospolitan kings, forty-three.

3. Seventeenth Dynasty of six Hyksos kings, reigned two hundred and fifty-nine years and ten months.

4. Together the Shepherds (Hyksos) and Thebans reigned five hundred and eighteen years.

Now, bearing in mind that the Hyksos Dynasty was substituted for the Fifteenth Dynasty, which was Diospolitan, in order to conform to the supposed arrangement of Josephus, we need not be surprised to find some trace of it in the next following dynasty. The Sixteenth Dynasty, which was originally "thirty-two Thebaid kings," was changed so as to read: "Thirty-two *other* Shepherd-kings, reigned five hundred and eighteen (!) years." There was no foundation whatever, in my opinion, for "*other* Shepherd-kings," because we know positively that the great Hyksos Dynasty, composed of Saïtes, Paian, Apophis,

Sethos, Iannus, etc., immediately preceded the Eighteenth Dynasty, and that these were the "*first kings*" among them. In other words, as the six kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty were the *first* Hyksos kings, there could have been none *before* them, and, as the thirty-six years and seven months of Apophis II, the last king of this dynasty, extend down to 1837 B. C., the date of the Hyksos Expulsion, there were none *after* them.

The only occasion for "*other* Shepherd-kings" appears in Manetho's general chronological scheme, where the 1,797 years of the "Memphite kings" are followed by the 1,810 years of his "*other* kings." The joint dynasties, Sixteenth Theban and Seventeenth Hyksos, headed the column of these "*other* kings," and, as the forger of the Africanian Lists needed "*other*" Hyksos kings to fill out the blank of two hundred and fifty-one years left by transferring the Hyksos kings to the Fifteenth Dynasty, he simply changed "*other* kings" to "*other* Shepherd-kings."

In conclusion, we can not refrain from adding that modern Egyptologists, since Bunsen and Lepsius, fail to appreciate the importance of the Manethonian Lists, and even endeavor, by insinuation or misrepresentation, to discredit and belittle them. They have been, and always will be (unless some equally reliable history may yet come to light), the chief corner-stone of modern Egyptology.

The perplexities by which modern Egyptologists found themselves surrounded when they ventured

upon this period of Egyptian history and chronology, without the guiding hand of Manetho, are summed up by Brugsch, in these lines:

“Fragments and patchwork wherever we look. The Table of Kings of Abydos passes with a sudden leap over this wide chasm. The traditions of the ancients, derived from the historical *data* in the work of Manetho, serve up to us error and confusion, instead of truth and clearness. Fate has thus done its worst to place the greatest difficulties in the way of the solution of this question, and the hard task is laid on human sagacity of collecting the slight sparks, in order to kindle a light which may illumine the darkness of five hundred years. With what active zeal has science endeavored to fill up the huge gaps! How has she sought for a firm point which might serve her as a fulcrum! All, however, has been in vain, and only the hope remains that we may at length some day gain the solution of the riddle from hidden, and as yet undiscovered, memorials.”

The solution of the riddle, however, did not depend on “hidden and undiscovered memorials;” but was contained in the “historical data”—truly scanty enough—derived from the work of Manetho.

The wide chasm supposed to exist between the Sixth and Twelfth Dynasties shrank upon examination from seven hundred and fifty to one hundred and forty-eight years. But the gap between the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties, on the contrary, widens from five hundred to seven hundred and fifty-three years. Firm points, astronomically fixed, to serve

as fulcrums, are by no means wanting. Among the most important, we may mention the following:

1. The great Sothiac Era 2784 B. C., in conjunction with the epoch-reigns of Amenemes I and User-tasen III.

2. The six hundred years from the birth of Noah, 2948 B. C., to the '*Aamu* Flood, 2348 B. C.

3. The four hundred and fifty-three years from the beginning of the Twelfth Dynasty, 2801 B. C., to the Hyksos Invasion, 2348 B. C.

4. The four hundred and eighty-four years of the combined Thirteenth and Fourteenth Dynasties ( $242+242=484$ ).

5. The 1,797 years of the "Memphite kings," beginning 3894 B. C. and ending 2097 B. C., at the close of the Fifteenth, and beginning of the Sixteenth and Hyksos Dynasties.

6. The two hundred and fifty-one years of the Fifteenth Dynasty (Diospolitan), reaching from 2348 B. C. to 2097 B. C.

7. The exact coincidence of the epoch-reigns of *Pa-ian* and *Set-nubti* (Sethos) of the Hyksos Dynasty, when we place the beginning of this dynasty at 2097 B. C.

8. The exact agreement of the epoch-reign of Aahmes, before the epoch 1824 B. C., with the date of the Hyksos Expulsion, 1837 B. C., to wit, the thirteen years of "Chebros."

9. The five hundred and eleven years of the Hyksos domination in Egypt, from 2348 B. C. to 1837 B. C.

10. The four hundred years from the Era of *Setnubti* (Sethos), the fourth Hyksos king, 1944 B. C., to the eighteenth year of Ramesses II Miamun, 1544 B. C.

THE EXTRACTS OF BARBARUS SCALIGERI FROM  
AFRICANUS. (THESAUR. TEMPP. T. II, P. 74.)

|       |   |           |
|-------|---|-----------|
| I.    | Mineus et pronepotes ipsius septem regnaverunt annos, . . . . . | 253       |
| II.   | Regnaverunt et aliorum octo annos, . . . . .                    | 302       |
| III.  | Nechocheus et aliorum octo annos, . . . . .                     | 214       |
| IV.   | Similiter aliorum septemdecim annos, . . . . .                  | 214       |
| V.    | Similiter aliorum viginti unus annos, . . . . .                 | 258       |
| VI.   | Othoi et aliorum septem annos, . . . . .                        | 203       |
| VII.  | (Wanting), . . . . .  |           |
| VIII. | Similiter et aliorum quatuordecim annos, . . . . .              | 142       |
| IX.   | Similiter et aliorum viginti annos, . . . . .                   | 409       |
| XII.  | Similiter et aliorum septem annos, . . . . .                    | 204       |
|       | Potestas Diospolitanorum annos, . . . . .                       | 9         |
|       | Potestas Bubastinorum annos, . . . . .                          | 153 (453) |
|       | Potestas Tanitorum annos, . . . . .                             | 184 (484) |
|       | Potestas Sebennitarum annos, . . . . .                          | 224 (242) |
|       | Potestas Memphitarum annos, . . . . .                           | 318 (518) |
|       | Potestas Iliopolitarum annos, . . . . .                         | 221 (251) |
|       | Potestas Ermupolitorum annos, . . . . .                         | 260 (260) |


We have inserted the above extracts from Africanus *after* the Twelfth Dynasty, instead of at the head of Manetho's First Book, because they throw a welcome ray of light upon the period intervening between the Twelfth Dynasty and the Hyksos Invasion. It seems that Manetho, following the ancient registers, summed up at the end of the Old Empire and again at the end of the Middle Empire.

Thus we have seen that the sum 453, now out of place, belongs to the "Potestas Diospolitanorum," and the sum 484, now also out of place, to the con-

temporary. Thirteenth and Fourteenth Dynasties, each of which reigned side by side, one at Memphis, the other at Xoïs, or Sebennytus, for two hundred and forty-two years.

We are chiefly concerned about the “Potestas Sebennitarum;” that is, the dynasty of Heracleopolites, who reigned contemporaneously with the Thebans of the Thirteenth Dynasty from 2590 B. C. to 2348 B. C. I think it will eventually turn out that Xoïs and Sebennytus are but two names for one and the same city. Many cities of ancient Egypt bore two or more names. Thus Tanis and *Per-Ramessu*, Suc-coth and *Per-tum*, are the popular and sacred names of two well known cities. In the same way the popular name Xoïs, in the course of time, may have given way to the sacred, or temple, name Sebennytus, now Semennud.

The Heracleopolites, who had established themselves at Xoïs in the Delta after their overthrow by the Thebans, about 2833 B. C., considered their right to the double crown of the two lands superior to that of the Diospolitans. In fact, it is probable that *Seti I*, in the Table of Abydus, recognized the kings of the Fourteenth Dynasty as his “ancestors.” Between Menthusuphis II and *Neb-cher-ra Menthu-hotep*, this table contains the throne-titles of eighteen kings, none of which can be identified with any of the rulers of the Eleventh, Thirteenth, or Fifteenth Dynasties. Are we not forced to assume that Seti I recognized, after the Sixth Dynasty, the kings of the Eighth, Twelfth, and Fourteenth Dynasties?



We have seen that Manetho, after completing his Thinite Dynasties, went back two hundred and fourteen years to take up the Memphite Dynasties, and that after completing these he again went back one hundred and forty-two years to take up the Heracleopolite Dynasties. This was the ancient Egyptian method, and it was but natural that Manetho should complete the Heracleopolite line before taking up the Theban line. By following this ancient method, *Seti* was enabled to place the kings of the Twelfth Dynasty immediately in front of the Eighteenth Dynasty in the Table of Abydos.

The divided kingdom under the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Dynasties seems to have culminated in disorder and great national weakness. Shem, Ham, and Japheth, who were born one hundred years before the Flood; that is, 2448 B. C., were “sons of *No-ôa*,” which means local governments set up in Egypt by these three foreign races. It appears from the extracts of Barbarus, that Manetho mentioned these foreign governments in his great historical work, and we can safely assume that the Shemite Government had its capital at Bubastis, the Hamite Government at Tanis, and the *Ia-pet-u* at some convenient point in the northwestern angle of the Delta.

It is hard to determine what is meant by “Iliopolitarum” and “Ermapolitorum,” for the corruption of these names may equal that of the numbers. The lists of Africanus had been changed before they reached Barbarus, as is evident from the seventeen kings of the Fourth Dynasty and thirty-one kings of the Sixth

Dynasty (viginti unus by mistake for triginti unus). We can assume, therefore, that the Hyksos kings had already been substituted for the Diospolitan kings of the Fifteenth Dynasty. Now, as the Hyksos kings, according to Manetho, held Memphis, the Fifteenth and Seventeenth Dynasties would be represented by "Potestas Memphitarum," the total of which was originally five hundred and eleven years. These dynasties would cover the numbers 251, 260, and 511. We should not forget that, in his chronological scheme, Manetho had, *first*, Thinite kings for three hundred and fifty years; *then* "Memphite kings" for 1,797 years; and, *lastly*, "Other Kings" for 1,810 years. The "Memphite kings" include the Fifteenth Dynasty, which was Diospolitan, and the "Other Kings" begin with the Hyksos Dynasty, 2097 B. C. These Hamite kings were the actual Pharaohs, holding the ancient capital Memphis for two hundred and sixty years. During this period Manetho had two dynasties, the Sixteenth, Theban, and the Seventeenth, Hyksos. Although the foreigners, being the actual Pharaohs, naturally came first, Manetho, true to the Egyptian custom, completed the Theban line before he took up the Hyksos Dynasty.

Now, as Manetho had but three dynasties between the Hyksos Invasion and the Eighteenth Dynasty, all of which are satisfactorily accounted for, it follows that the Tanites, Bubastites, etc., found by Barbarus in the chronological work of Africanus, must be placed in the period of two hundred and forty-two years between the Twelfth Dynasty and Hyksos In-

vasion, which is a most remarkable confirmation of the Mosaic account of affairs during the period of one hundred years immediately preceding the Noachian Flood.

### LOCATION OF THE PYRAMIDS

If the first dynasty of "Thinites" reigned at Heliopolis, as we contend, the pyramids of Abu-roash would correspond to the "pyramids of Kochome," built by *Kebahu*, as epoch king "Uen-nepher." These pyramids are near the old nome of *Ka-kem* and opposite Heliopolis, just where we might expect to find them.

The celebrated "Step-pyramid" of Sakkara, which was built by Necherochis (*Nuter-achi*), the first king of the Third Dynasty, is opposite Memphis. When we consider that Necherochis, the first "Memphite king," reigned contemporaneously with Binothris, the third king of the Second Thinite Dynasty, the one at Memphis, the other at Heliopolis, the position of this venerable pyramid agrees perfectly with the historical facts. The dividing line between the two kingdoms at that time was a short distance only below Memphis. Thus Eratosthenes recognizes the Memphite kings of the Third Dynasty as Theban kings, which could not have been the case if the Second Dynasty had been located south of Memphis or at Abydos.

The Fourth Dynasty ruled over both countries, hence we find the Pyramids of Chufu, Chafra, and Menkaura at Ghizeh near the old capital, Heliopolis.

It is true that Senoferu erected his pyramid at Meydum; but this may have been commenced before he succeeded in uniting the two kingdoms.

As the Pyramids of Ghizeh follow each other from north to south, I suspect that the small Pyramids of Zawyet-el-Arrian belong to Shepseskaf, the last king of the Fourth Dynasty, and Userkaf, the first king of the Fifth Dynasty.

The northernmost of the three large Pyramids of Abusir belongs to Sahura, the next to Ranuser, and the third, as I believe, to Tatkara Assa, all of the Fifth Dynasty. The Pyramid of Unas, the last king of the Fifth Dynasty, as we might have assumed *before* it was opened in 1881, is south of these.

The Sixth Dynasty was Elephantinæn; that is, of a different line; and Teta, accordingly, sought a new field, and built his pyramid near that of Necherochis, at Sakkara. The Pyramids of Pepa I, Menthusuphis I, and Pepa II follow successively as we proceed southwardly from the Pyramid of Unas.

No great pyramids were erected during the period of one hundred and forty-eight years following the downfall of the Old Empire; but the kings of the Twelfth Dynasty, after the kingdom had been re-established, again erected their pyramids near the old capital between Dahshur (*Tash-ur*) and the Fayum. The Pyramid of Amenemes III was within the Fayum, and adjoined the celebrated Labyrinth, which was accounted one of the "Wonders of the World."

The Thirteenth Dynasty, owing to the rival dynasty of Heracleopolites at Xoïs, or Sebennytus, was

too weak to erect large and enduring pyramids, although its kings held Memphis. One of the last kings of this dynasty was buried near the pyramid of a king of the Twelfth Dynasty. The Hyksos Invasion put an end to pyramid building. Thus the location of the pyramids agrees with the assumed development of Egypt from the north to the south, and not *vice versa*.

#### THIRTEENTH DYNASTY OF SIXTEEN DIOSPOLITAN KINGS

In the Table of Karnak, and on the fragment of The Turin papyrus given in *facsimile* on Plate XIII of Lepsius's "Book of Kings," *Sebku-noferu-ra* follows immediately after *Maat-cheru-ra* (Amenemes IV).

Manetho closes his Twelfth Dynasty with Skemiofris (Sebkunofris), who reigned four years, or, according to the papyrus, three years, ten months, and twenty-four days. In the List of Africanus "Skemiofris" is termed "sister;" but there is nothing but the throne-title, *Sebku-noferu-ra*, to correspond to the *sa-ra*, or proper name of Manetho. The sister of Amenemes IV may have reigned as regent during the minority of the king. Be this as it may, the short reign of *Sebku-noferu-ra* was followed by a *division* of the kingdom.

From the earliest times Egypt was divided into the Upper Country and Lower Country, and the division was so strongly marked that it was never lost sight of. The most powerful Pharaohs ruled in a dual capacity as *Suten*, "King of Upper Egypt," and *Buti*, "King of Lower Egypt." I believe that the

Vulture-Uræus title, called “Lord of Diadems,” points to a still more ancient division of the government.

There was always a tendency to separation, which became more marked in times of oppression or adversity. The reign of the Elephantinean kings of the Sixth Dynasty culminated in a division of the kingdom; and the burdens imposed on the people of Lower Egypt and the vicinity of the Fayum by Amenemes III and his children, during a period of fully fifty years, likewise led to the defection of the greater portion of Lower Egypt. A rival dynasty, called the Fourteenth, established at Xoïs, in the heart of the Delta, became independent about 2590 B. C.; but the ancient capital, Memphis, remained in the possession of the Theban line. As we have just seen, Manetho classed the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Dynasties of Diospolitan kings with the “Memphite kings;” besides we are forced to assume that the kings of the Fourteenth Dynasty fixed their capital at Xoïs.

The last king in the List of Eratosthenes, called Amuthartaïos, has a reign of sixty-three years, and it seems that Eusebius obtained his total of two hundred and forty-five years for the Twelfth Dynasty by adding these sixty-three years to the one hundred and eighty-two years of the separate reigns. The last three reigns in his list now appear as follows:

|   |          |   |
|---|----------|---|
| Sesostris, . . . . .                          | 48 years |   |
| Lamaris, who built the Arsinoïte Labyrinth as |          |   |
| his tomb, etc., . . . . .                     | 8        | “ |
| His successors reigned, . . . . .             | 42       | “ |
|   | <hr/>    |   |
| Total, . . . . .                              | 245      | “ |

The separate numbers foot up one hundred and eighty-two years only; hence it is evident that the list originally stood as follows:

|                                       |          |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Sesostris (Usertasen III), . . . . .  | 38 years |
| "Ramais" (Amen-em-het III), . . . . . | 42 "     |
| "His successors," . . . . .           | 63 "     |
| Total, . . . . .                      | 245 "    |

But this was not Manetho's arrangement, for the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Dynasties commence simultaneously at 2590 B. C., the date of the division of the kingdom. The names and reigns of the kings of this dynasty, and in fact all the following dynasties down to the Seventeenth, or Hyksos, Dynasty, are now wanting in the lists, and we are compelled to grope our way without the assistance of Manetho or Eratosthenes.

In the Table of Karnak the kings are grouped so as to bring certain favored ones immediately in front of the standing figure of Thothmes III, and, to add to the difficulties, the names of these favored kings—four in number—are destroyed, with the exception of one in the third section, (*Sochem*)-*uah-chau-ra*.

The portion of the Turin papyrus containing the names and reigns of the kings of this entire period exists in fragments of different shapes and sizes, between which there are often gaps of unknown extent. Fragment 72 contains the names of nine kings belonging to the Thirteenth Dynasty. It is probable that two names are lost by the break between this fragment and the following piece, composed of frag-

ments 76, 77, and 78. The following are the fragments relating to this period:

### TURIN PAPYRUS

#### FRAGMENT 72.

1. Chu-tau-ra.
2. Sochem-ka-ra, *ari-en-ef em suteniu*, 2544 B. C.
3. Ra(Amen ?) em-het.
4. Se-hotep-ab-ra.
5. Auf-ni.
6. S'anch-ab-ra.
8. Se-hotep-ab-ra.
9. ———ka-ra.

#### FRAGMENTS 76, 77, AND 78.

1. Notem-ab-ra.
2. Sebku-hotep-ra.
3. Ran——kau (*ari-en-ef em suteniu*), 2424 B. C.
4. Autu-(fu ?) ab-ra Har (?)
5. Sezef——ra.
6. Sochem-chu-tau-ra Sebku-hotep.
7. User——ra.

#### FRAGMENTS 78 AND 79.

1. [S'mench-ka]-ra Emir Meshau.
2. ———ka——(?)
3. ———user-ka——(?)
4. Sochem-s'uat-tau-ra Sebku-hotep.
5. Cha-seshes-ra Nofer-hotep.
6. Sa-ha-et-har (Hathor).
7. Cha-nofer-ra Sebku-hotep.

#### FRAGMENT 81.

1. Cha-hotep-ra.
2. Uah-ab-ra Ianu ab.
3. Mer-nofer-ra (*ari-en-ef em suteniu*), 2064 B. C.
4. Mer-hotep-ra.
5. S'anch-s'uat-(?) ra.
6. Mer-sochem-ra An-ran.
7. S'uat-ka-ra Har.
8. (?) em (?) ra.

#### FRAGMENT 97.

1. Nahu-si.
2. Cha-cheru-ra.
3. Neb-ef-autu-ra.
4. Se-heb.
5. Mer-zefa-ra.
6. S'uat-ka-ra.
7. Neb-zefa-ra.
8. Uben——ra.

#### FRAGMENTS 98 AND 99.

1. ———zefa-ra.
2. ———uben-ra.
3. Autu-ab-ra.
4. Har-ab-ra.
5. Neb-sen-ra.

It will be seen that the second king, *Sochem-ka-ra*, is distinguished as an epoch-king by "*ari-en-ef em suteniu*," and it is stated that the epoch fell in the

sixth year of his reign. The papyrus gives *Chu-tai-ra* sixty years, while Eratosthenes gives Amuthartaïos sixty-three years. It seems, therefore, that the first two kings of this dynasty reigned jointly for many years. Although Amuthartaïos appears last in the List of Eratosthenes, I believe that Siphthas (*Sa-Ptah*, "Son of Vulcan"), with a reign of five years, represents the epoch-reign of *Sochem-ka-ra* before the epoch 2544 B. C., for the reason that it agrees accurately with the papyrus, and "Siphthas" is undoubtedly an epoch-title.

Allowing two names for the gap between fragment 72 on the one hand, and fragments 76, 77, and 78 on the other, there were eleven kings between *Sochem-ka-ra* Siphthas and the next epoch-king *Ran . . . kau*, who marks the epoch of Tybi, 2424 B. C. The first element *Ran* has a determinative showing that it means "name," and it is possible that the destroyed portion contained an epoch-title. As this dynasty came to a close 2348 B. C., it reigned seventy-six years after this epoch. Assuming that *Ran . . . kau* was the fourteenth king, *Fu-ab-ra Har* and *Sesef . . . . ra* were the last kings of this dynasty. The sixteen kings of this dynasty built their tombs between Memphis and the Fayum. They seem to have been weak and insignificant, and very few monuments dating from their reigns have reached us. If their tombs had been in the vicinity of Thebes, they would have been mentioned in the Abbott papyrus, or some remains of them would have survived. That they were of the Diospolitan line we know from the

Table of Karnak, where *S'anch-ab-ra* appears as No. 3, and *Chu-tai-ra* as No. 20. No doubt others appeared among the destroyed and mutilated ovals; but as they were not particularly distinguished, they were distributed around, regardless of order, in the places left vacant after certain groups had been provided for. It so happens that these have suffered most.

There is no authority for calling *Chu-tai-ra* "*Sebku-hotep I.*" One of the kings of this dynasty bore the throne-title *Sebku-hotep*; but we have no evidence that any of them bore this *name*.

The tomb of the next to the last king of this dynasty, *Fu-ab-ra Har*, was found in a pit near the brick pyramid of Dahshur. It had been rifled in ancient times; but a wooden statue, parts of the coffin, and other objects remained. A coffer was sealed up, and bore an impression reading "*Ra-en-maat.*" I see in the name Dahshur a survival of *Tash-ur*; that is, "ancient boundary," or dividing line, between Upper and Lower Egypt, a vicinity which would naturally have a special attraction for kings of the Theban line, claiming, but unable to assert, sovereignty over Lower Egypt. This tomb of one of the last kings of this dynasty proves that Manetho was right in calling it "Diospolitan" and classing it with "Memphite kings." *Har* added to the throne-title indicates that this king's name was compounded with *Har*. Relying on Manetho and this king's position at the end of the dynasty, I venture the prediction that his *Sa-ra* name was *Har-ti-ma*, "Horus, the Lancer," rendered *Timaïos* by Manetho, the unfortunate king who hap-

pened to be on the throne when the '*Aamu* invasion occurred.

In conclusion, we should bear in mind that the epoch 2544 B. C. fell in the sixth year of *Sochem-ka-ra*, the second king of this dynasty, and that we have fourteen reigns, exclusive of this king, in the remaining period of one hundred and ninety-six years, making the average so short that we are bound to assume that other than normal conditions prevailed; that is, either wars or internal dissensions.

The Fourteenth Dynasty ruled side by side with this dynasty at Xoïs, in the heart of the Delta. According to the Mosaic account, three sons were born to Noah one hundred years before the Flood, or 2448 B. C. Of course, these were governments founded by Shem, Ham, and Japheth, in Egypt. Barbarus, who drew from Africanus, found immediately after the Twelfth Dynasty such items as "*Potestas Tanitorum*," etc., showing that Manetho mentioned the local governments at Tanis, Bubastis, Sebenny-tus, etc., which agrees with the conditions implied. In the first place, the native kingdom at Xoïs was too weak to prevent the inroads of Hamites and Shemites on the eastern frontier of the Delta, and *Tamahu*, or Libyans, of Japhetic race, on the western frontier. These races effected permanent settlements in the Delta, and established racial governments,—the '*Aamu* at Tanis, Shemites at Bubastis and in the land of Goshen, and Libyans in the northwestern angle of the Delta, presumably at Rakotis, the later Alexandria, although it is possible that they also held

the city of Sais. In the second place, it is evident that the Thirteenth Dynasty was also too weak to prevent the dismemberment of Lower Egypt, or to take advantage of it. Such a miserable state of affairs weakened and paralyzed the country, and brought down upon Egypt one of those remarkable floods of half-civilized yellow Asiatics, or '*Aamu*, by which the civilized world has been periodically scourged and deluged.

#### THE HYKSOS INVASION

We now come to the greatest calamity that ever befell the Egyptian State prior to the Persian Invasion.

In the year 2348 B. C., after the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Dynasties had reigned side by side for two hundred and forty-two years, a flood of yellow Asiatics, '*Aamu*, or "Hamites," swept down from the "eastern parts;" that is, the portion of Asia lying east of Babylonia, and inundated Western Asia and the Delta. These people were known to the Egyptians by the race-name '*Aamu*, "Ham," and this name appears on the monuments as far back as the beginning of the Sixth Dynasty. The Shemites, in contradistinction to the '*Aamu*, were called *Mentiu*, "Syrians," *Hirusha*, and *Satiu*, "Beduin," etc.

In the pictorial representations of the four races in the tombs of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties, the Asiatic, or *yellow*, race is called '*Aamu*, "Ham;" the Japhetic, or *white*, race *Temahu*; the African, or *black*, race *Nahsu*; and the native Egyptians, or *rosy*, race *Lutu*, "*Leute*."

The derivation and meaning of "Ham" is so clear that it is hard to understand how scientists derived it from *kem*, "black," or *Kemi*, "Black Land," a name applied to the Delta. They started out with the false and groundless assumption that the race-name "Ham" designated the black race, and then willfully closed their eyes to all that the monuments disclosed and taught on the subject. Prior to the Exodus the Negroes were seated in Africa, south of Egypt; their race-name on the monuments is invariably *Nahsu*. We must be careful not to confound the Cushites, *Kashi*, or Ethiopians, with the Negroes; for "Cush" was a "son of Ham," and, therefore, derived from the Asiatic '*Aamu*.

The inhabitants of the Sinaitic peninsula, and of Canaan, Assyria, and Babylonia, were at no time Negroes, or *Nahsu*; but, on the contrary, ruddy and yellow Shemites and Hamites. The native Egyptians were as far removed from the '*Aamu* as they were from the *Nahsu*. Originally of a light rosy hue, their bodies, by long exposure to the direct rays of a semi-tropical sun, acquired a dark ruddy color similar to that of our own Indians; but this effect was not so pronounced in the women and children. They were closely allied, by race, language, and mental characteristics, to the great European, or Japhetic, race; and their nearest living representatives are the Saxons, Danes, and Scandinavians. The '*Aamu* Flood of 2348 B. C. was not the only devastating flood of Hamites recorded in history. The invasion of Europe by the *Huns*, about 450 A. D., and the still more re-

cent irruption of the Turks into Asia Minor and Southeastern Europe, are well known and well authenticated historical events, or, I might say, *calamities*. What I wish particularly to call attention to, is the unmistakable talent for government developed by these people on all of these occasions, although they appear to have been barbarians in other respects. Of course, the word "government," in this connection, applies to despotic and tyrannical governments only, such as Asia has always been cursed with.

My discoveries, viewed in the light of the monuments and the Bible narrative, show that the '*Aamu* Invasion of Egypt, and the nature of their government over Egypt during the first two hundred and fifty-one years of '*Aamu* domination, differed radically from the descriptions thereof to be found in the modern works on the subject. In the first place, the sovereign, or great "king of nations," was not in Egypt at all, but in far-off Elam!

Josephus has transmitted an account of the Hyksos Invasion of Egypt, taken from the Second Book of Manetho's Egyptian History, and purporting to be in the very words of Manetho. As it is the only account we have of this catastrophe, we insert it literally:

"There was a king of ours, whose name was Timaios. Under him it came to pass, I know not how, that God was averse to us, and there came, after a surprising manner, men of ignoble birth out of the

*eastern parts*, and had boldness enough to make an expedition into our country, and with ease subdued it by force, yet without our hazarding a battle with them. So when they had gotten those that governed us under their power, they afterwards burned down our cities, and demolished the temples of the gods, and used all the inhabitants after a most barbarous manner. Nay, some they slew, and led their wives and children into slavery."

We break the connection here to suggest that, at this point, the epitomist from whom Josephus copied made a leap of two hundred and fifty-one years, omitting an essential part of Manetho's narrative, as we shall see hereinafter:

"At length they made one of themselves king, whose name was Salatis (*Saites-Seth*). He *also* lived at Memphis, and made both the upper and lower regions pay tribute, and left garrisons in places that were the most proper for them. He chiefly aimed to secure the eastern parts, as foreseeing that the Assyrians, who had then the greatest power, would be desirous of that kingdom and invade them; and as he found in the Saite Nomos, a city very proper for this purpose, and which lay upon the Bubastic channel, but with regard to certain theological notions was called Avaris; this he rebuilt, and made very strong by the walls he built about it, and by a most numerous garrison of 240,000 armed men, whom he put into it to keep it. Thither Salatis (*Saites*) came in summer-time, partly to gather his corn and pay his soldiers their wages, and partly to exercise his armed men, and thereby to terrify foreigners."

After giving the names and reigns of the six kings of Manetho's Hyksos Dynasty, Josephus continues as follows:

"And these six were the first rulers among them, who were all along making war with the Egyptians, and were very desirous gradually to destroy them to the very roots. This whole nation was styled Hyksos; that is, Shepherd-kings; for the first syllable, Hyk, according to the sacred dialect, denotes a king, as is Sos, a shepherd—but this according to the ordinary dialect; and of these is compounded Hyksos: but some say that these were Arabians."

While on the subject of the meaning of the word "Hyksos," which we have shown to be *Hyk-satu*, "King of foreign countries," it will be noticed that Manetho, after saying that "*Hyk*" means King in the sacred dialect—that is, the ancient hieroglyphic language—is careful to explain that "Sos" means shepherd in the ordinary dialect, showing that he knew it meant foreign countries as written hieroglyphically in *Hyk-satu*, a title borne, as the monuments show, by the Hyksos-king *Chian*, or *Ach-ian*.

It seems that Josephus had before him two excerpts of Manetho's account, for he adds:

"Now, in another copy it is said that this word does not denote kings; but, on the contrary, denotes captive shepherds, and this on account of the particle Hyk, for that Hyk, with the aspiration, in the Egyptian tongue, again denotes shepherds, and that expressly also; and this to me seems a more probable opinion, and more agreeable to ancient history."

The meaning of this is very transparent. Manetho, in his history, said that Hyksos, in the sacred dialect, meant "Ruler of foreign countries;" but that in the later demotic, or ordinary, dialect *hyk* aspirated also meant captive, and *sos* (*shas*) also meant shepherd; that is, *shasu*, or Beduin. If Manetho's history contained the first derivation given by Josephus, it could not have contained the second quoted from "another copy." The fact that they are so inconsistent shows that both were *extracts* colored to suit each writer's peculiar notions.

"These people, whom we have before named kings, and called shepherds, as he says, kept possession of Egypt five hundred and eleven years."

We are told that the men of ignoble birth out of the "eastern parts" (Elam) took Egypt by surprise. In his account of the campaign of Sethos (Seti I), Manetho uses this expression—"eastern parts"—in connection with the intervening countries, so that there can be no doubt as to the locality meant thereby. Sethos "made an expedition against the Assyrians and the Medes." After he had subdued these, "he went on still more boldly, and overthrew the cities and countries that lay in the *eastern parts*." Thus it is plain that the "eastern parts" of Manetho were the countries beyond Assyria and Medea. If the invaders had been *Mentiu*, *Satiu*, or *Hirusha*, Manetho would have designated them as Syrians, Phœnicians, or Arabians, just as we sometimes speak of English and French when we really mean British and Gauls.

The monuments support Manetho as to the burn-

ing of cities, demolishing of temples, and barbarous treatment of the inhabitants in Lower Egypt, for Thebes was not taken.

Josephus did not copy what Manetho said about the first two hundred and fifty-one years of '*Aamu* domination. He was trying to prove that these yellow, serpent-worshipping '*Aamu* were the Hebrews, who, after entering Egypt at the invitation of Pharaoh, and sojourning there for two hundred and fifteen years as an oppressed people, were led out by Moses against the wish of the Egyptians. For this reason Josephus arranged his extracts in such a way as to create the impression that the Hyksos Dynasty of Egyptian Pharaohs followed right after the Invasion, and a vague period of two hundred and fifty-one years intervened between the Hyksos Dynasty and the Expulsion. Of course, he was careful not to assert this in so many words; but, as the separate reigns of the Hyksos kings footed up two hundred and fifty-nine years and ten months, and the entire period of '*Aamu* domination was five hundred and eleven years, he led the reader to infer it; and it was so understood by the early chronologists who changed the Africanian Lists. The attempt to identify these barbarians, and their forcible conquest and occupation of the Delta, with the Hebrews and their peaceable settlement and sojourn in the land of Goshen, is so ridiculous and preposterous on its face that it is not entitled to serious consideration.

When Manetho, speaking of the invaders, adds, "Some say that they were Arabians," he means *Hiru-*

*sha* or *Satiu*; but he wrote for the Greeks and in the Greek language, about the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, or 287 B. C., and naturally used the names by which these people were known to them. Manetho himself does not say they were Arabians; neither does he call them Phœnicians, Assyrians (including Babylonians), or Medes. In the Egyptian annals and registers translated by Manetho they were called '*Aamu*, or Hamites; but he could find no equivalent Greek term for '*Aamu*; therefore he described them simply as "men of ignoble birth from the eastern parts." As far back as 2448 B. C., one hundred years before the Flood, there were Hamites in Egypt, who had established a local government at Tanis (Zoan). Shemites and Japhites likewise had established local governments in the Delta at the same time. All these governments retreated up the Nile, and took refuge in Thebes, where they remained until the Flood had subsided.

The *pseudo*-Sothis list of Syncellus mentions Tanite kings in connection with the Manethonian Dynasties; and Josephus quotes Manetho as saying that the kings of the Thebais and the *other parts* of Egypt raised the standard of revolt against the Hyksos. But, in addition to this, the inscription of Queen *Het-shepsut*, published by Golenischeff, states that the resident '*Aamu* (in and around Tanis) assisted the foreign '*Aamu* invaders in destroyng the temples and burning the cities, which removes every remaining doubt on the subject.

Now, what does this prove as to King Timaios

(*Har-ti-ma?*), named by Manetho as ruling at the time of the Hyksos Invasion? The Thirteenth Dynasty, as we have seen, was "Diospolitan," held Memphis and built their tombs between that city and the Fayum. Timaïos was the next to the last king of this dynasty, which came to an end at the time of the Hyksos Invasion. We have seen that M. de Morgan, in April, 1894, discovered the tomb of *Fu-ab-ra* (also written *Autu-ab-ra*) *Har*, at Dahshur (*Tash-ur*) near Memphis. As *Fu-ab-ra Har* appears on fragments 76, 77, and 78 of the papyrus, immediately after an epoch-king, as one of the Diospolitan kings of the Thirteenth Dynasty, Egyptologists were naturally surprised and puzzled to find his tomb so far from the supposed capital, Thebes; but the "find" agrees perfectly with Manetho's arrangement and classification of these dynasties. Not until we reach the Sixteenth Dynasty of the Thebaid can we expect to find the royal tombs at Thebes. When the local kings of the Sixteenth Dynasty began to build their last resting-places near Thebes, they followed the rulers of the Eleventh Dynasty, and imitated their peculiar style of architecture and art. They also revived the old names Antef and Mentuhotep. This circumstance makes it appear as if the Sixteenth Dynasty had immediately succeeded the Eleventh; for the Twelfth Dynasty, as we have seen, was imperial, resided at Memphis, and built its pyramids in that vicinity.

The local governments of Shem, Ham, and Japheth in the Delta, although formed out of territory subject to the Theban kings of the Twelfth Dy-

nasty—hence “sons of Noah”—did not interfere with the possession of Memphis. As Ham ruled at Tanis, we can safely locate Shem at Bubastis. According to this, the “Land of Goshen” was Semitized long before the Israelites of Canaan settled there.

The main body of the *'Aamu* swarm settled down in Elam and Babylonia, forcing the Shemites northwardly into the mountains of Assyria, and southwardly into the deserts of Arabia. After the invaders had conquered Canaan, their *army* fell upon Egypt; but as the Egyptians submitted without resistance, the killing, plundering, and pillaging was sporadic, rather than systematic. The *'Aamu* government at Tanis, to judge from the inscription of Queen *Het-shepsut*, joined and assisted them. In the course of time the Hamites naturalized in Egypt, owing to their superior civilization, gained the complete ascendancy over the foreign *'Aamu*, and founded governments among them patterned upon the Egyptian model. Thus Cush was a son of Ham; that is, the original *'Aamu* government established at Tanis about one hundred years before the Hyksos Invasion; just as Mizraim, or the Hyksos Dynasty, was a son of this same Hamite government. We are likewise assured that Canaan was a son of Ham. The direct and proximate effect of the Hyksos Invasion, therefore, was the dispersion of many of the inhabitants of the Delta—Shemites, Japhites, and Hamites—into the neighboring countries, carrying with them and disseminating among other nations more or less confused and distorted notions of the arts, learning, and

civilization of the Egyptians. The statues of Naramsin, Gudea, and other "most ancient" kings of Babylonia resemble in style the Egyptian models of the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Dynasties, from which they were copied. This is what we are bound to infer from the Mosaic account, according to which Nimrod, by whom the first kingdom in Babylonia was founded, was a son of Cush, and, therefore, subsequent to Ham.

### THE ALLEGORY OF THE FLOOD

Josephus tells us that Moses "speaks some things wisely, but enigmatically, and others under a decent allegory; but still explained such things as required a direct explication plainly and expressly." The modern world, however, disregarding this evident fact, insists upon a literal interpretation of the symbols, enigmatical expressions, and allegories with which the opening chapters of Genesis abound, and thereby involves itself in all kinds of inconsistencies and contradictions. The story of the Flood is an allegory, under which the Hyksos Invasion of Egypt is veiled and hidden. The flood and invasion both occurred at the same time, and affected the same governments, to wit: Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. A literal interpretation of the allegory, its beasts of the field and fowls of the air, its waters and its ark, has had the effect of almost blotting out nearly two thousand years of glorious and eventful history in ancient Egypt, and of plunging mankind into centuries of error and darkness.

•


The scope of this work prevents me from going into a critical examination of the meaning of the symbols used in this allegory; but any one desirous of doing so, can find the key in Ezekiel, chapter 31. In fact, chapter 47 of Jeremiah symbolizes the Assyrian conquest of Palestine, Tyre, and Sidon, as an overwhelming flood of waters out of the north, covering the land and all that was therein, the cities and the inhabitants thereof. Here, where the corresponding historical fact was near at hand, no one ever dreamed of *literal* waters covering the land, or *literal* floods and torrents; but after the great drop-curtain had been lowered at 2348 B. C., the historical fact back of the allegory of the universal flood (Egypt was the world) was hidden from view, and forgotten. The allegory itself originated during the Hyksos domination over Egypt, for it was carried into Babylonia by the Hamites and survived in the celebrated "Flood Legends" discovered and translated by George Smith.

We have seen that, according to Bible chronology, the birth of Noah occurred in the year 2948 B. C., and Noah was six hundred years old when the Flood broke loose over the land. We have demonstrated that Thebes became independent at the downfall of the Old Empire in the year 2948 B. C., and that the Theban Government continued through the Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth Dynasties, exactly six hundred years to the Hyksos Invasion. We have also seen that the dynasties of Heracleopolis endured five hundred and ninety-four years from the

beginning of the Eighth Dynasty, 2942 B. C., to the Hyksos Invasion. It can not be chance that these dates agree and harmonize so perfectly, and that Noah bears the distinctive name of Thebes, bestowed upon this city during the brilliant epoch of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties, when it enjoyed the fame of being the greatest city on the face of the earth—a fame echoed in the immortal epics of Homer.

Much has been written about the meaning and derivation of the name Thebes. In the allegory, Noah and his three sons escaped the Flood by retiring into the ark. Now, it can be seen in one of the earliest works on Egypt, to wit, "Egypt's Place in Universal History," Volume I, page 589, that Thebi, Thebe, or Taibe, means "ark," and that the Septuagint renders ark "Thibe" and "Thebe." Thus Genesis throws a welcome ray of light over a dark period of Egyptian history, just as the events narrated in the opening chapters of Genesis are supported by a background of historical facts recorded in the stone book of ancient Egypt, and freed from countless errors, woven around them by ignorance and superstition during the thirty-three centuries which have elapsed since the days of Moses.

When the storm had spent its force, and the waters (multitudes of people) coming and going had returned from off the earth, Noah and his sons came out of the ark, and resumed their former avocations. Before they did this, however, they sent forth the dove, which returned with the olive-branch. These



statements agree with what we actually find in Egypt immediately after the Hyksos conquest. Manetho tells us, unequivocally, that the Egyptians did not hazard a battle with the invaders. They retired up the Nile, took refuge in Thebes, sent out messengers offering their submission, which was accepted upon condition that they were to be subject and pay tribute to the great king of these people, in far-off Elam. We accordingly find (what we could not have foreseen) the Fifteenth Dynasty of Diospolis ruling over the same territory that had been subject to its predecessor, the Thirteenth Dynasty. To judge from Manetho's list, the Xoite Dynasty was destroyed, and did not rise again; neither do we hear anything more of the Heracleopolites. Thus the conditions were somewhat favorable for the Fifteenth Dynasty, which seems to have been more powerful than the Thirteenth Dynasty. We shall see that the *Seb-ku-hoteps*, with the exception of *Cha-hotep-ra*, formerly assigned to the Thirteenth Dynasty, probably belong here. This presents a state of affairs, so different from that commonly assumed, that it will certainly meet with opposition from those who are loath to abandon an old opinion, however erroneous it may prove to be; but it is always better to gracefully accept the *truth* in whatever form it is made to appear.

It has taxed credulity to the utmost, especially during the last half of the nineteenth century, to believe that the *first* man, or Adam, was created as recently as 4004 B. C.; that individuals, as late as 2000 B. C., attained the impossible ages of nine hun-

dred and fifty years; that in the year 2348 B. C. a literal flood of waters covered the whole earth to a depth of five or six miles, and destroyed every living creature, with the exception of such as escaped in a literal ark; and that an individual, after he had attained five hundred years of age, begat three sons, each of whom belonged to a different race.

The allusion to Noah's over-indulgence in wine and consequent nakedness after the Flood seems to indicate that Thebes was over-confident, and failed to protect herself sufficiently against attack after the invading hordes had retired, and that the '*Aamu* government at Tanis, or Ham, took occasion to betray this weakness (or *nakedness*, as it was then called) to the enemy; but that Shem and Japheth, retiring backwards—that is, up the Nile—protected Thebes. This language applies to Egypt; for the Egyptians, contrary to the custom of other nations, regarded the north as *up* and the south as *down*; hence, they went "backwards," or down, when they ascended the Nile.

The history and chronology of Egypt, supported by contemporary monuments and inscriptions, render it absolutely certain that there was no literal deluge such as that described in the allegory, in Egypt about 2348 B. C. In fact, tombs which are between five thousand and six thousand years old, and which have never been disturbed since the mummies were deposited in them, show no indications of a flood of literal waters. In some of them the footprints of the men who laid the mummies to rest were as plainly visible in the dust when the tombs were opened as

they were five thousand years ago, when first made. From a scientific point of view, a flood covering the entire earth to the tops of the highest mountains is a physical impossibility.

In his story of the destruction of Atlantis, Plato tells us what Solon learned from an aged Egyptian priest at Sais. Solon drew the priests on to speak of antiquity, by telling them about the most ancient things in his part of the world; about Phoroneus, who was called the first, and about Niobe; and by telling them about the flood of Deucalion. He traced the genealogy of the descendants of Deucalion and Pyrrha, and attempted to reckon how old these events were, and to give the dates. Thereupon the priest said that in mind the Greeks were all young:—

“There is no old opinion handed down among you by ancient tradition, nor any science which is hoary with age. And I will tell you the reason of this: there have been, and there will be again, many destructions of mankind arising out of many causes. There is a story which even you have preserved, that once upon a time Phaethon, the son of Helios, having yoked the steeds in his father's chariot, because he was not able to drive them in the path of his father, burnt all that was upon the earth, and was himself destroyed by a thunderbolt. Now, this has the form of a myth, but really signifies a declination of the bodies moving around the earth and in the heavens, and a great conflagration of things upon the earth recurring at long intervals of time: when this happens, those who live upon the mountains and in dry and lofty places are more liable to destruction than those who dwell by rivers or on the seashore; and

from this calamity the Nile, who is our never-failing 'saviour,' saves and delivers us. When, on the other hand, the gods purge the earth with a deluge of waters, among you herdsmen and shepherds on the mountains are the survivors, whereas those of you who live in cities are carried by the rivers into the sea; but in this country, neither at that time nor at any other, does the water come from above on the fields, having always a tendency to come up from below, for which reason the things preserved here are said to be the oldest. The fact is that wherever the extremity of winter frost or of summer sun does not prevent, the human race is always increasing at times, and at other times diminishing in numbers. And whatever happened, either in your country or in ours, or in any other region of which we are informed, if any action which is noble or great, or in any other way remarkable, has taken place, all that has been written down of old, and is preserved in our temples; whereas you and other nations are just being provided with letters and the other things which States require; and then, at the usual period, the stream from heaven descends like a pestilence, and leaves only those of you who are destitute of letters and education; and thus you have to begin all over again as children, and know nothing of what happened in ancient times, either among us or among yourselves.

"As for those genealogies of yours which you have recounted to us, Solon, they are no better than the tales of children; for, in the first place, you remember one deluge only, whereas there were many of them; and, in the next place, you do not know that there dwelt in your land the fairest and noblest race of men which ever lived, of whom you and your whole city are but a seed or remnant. And this was

---

unknown to you, because for many generations the survivors of that destruction died and made no sign. For there was a time, Solon, before that great deluge of all, when the city, which now is Athens, was first in war, and was pre-eminent for the excellence of her laws, and is said to have performed the noblest deeds, and to have had the fairest constitution of any of which tradition tells, under the face of heaven."

The priest then proceeded to tell Solon what their histories related of a mighty power which came forth out of the Atlantic Ocean, from an island situated in front of the Columns of Heracles, and subjected Libya as far as Egypt, and Europe as far as Tyrrhenia. This vast power was defeated by the Athenians. But afterward there occurred violent earthquakes and floods, and in a single day and night of rain the island of Atlantis disappeared, and sank beneath the sea. The island, which was larger than Asia and Libya put together, was the way to other islands, from which you might pass through the whole of the opposite continent, which surrounded the true ocean. The priest further informed Solon that the Mediterranean was only a harbor, having a narrow entrance; but that the other was a real sea, and the surrounding land might be most truly called a continent.

We have cited the above from Solon, through Plato, for the purpose of showing that no literal flood of waters, excepting the annual inundation, deluged Egypt during the six thousand years covered by her histories. If a universal deluge had actually occurred after the accession of Mena, Egypt would have been

the first country to suffer, because it is only a few feet above the level of the ocean, and there would certainly have been some evidences of it on the monuments strewn over the country from Nubia to Tanis, and some mention of it in their sacred registers.

The priest of Sais, about 600 B. C., said to Solon, "You remember one deluge only, whereas there were many of them;" and assured him that the Egyptians had written down and preserved in their temples accounts of everything noble or great, or otherwise remarkable, which had occurred in Egypt or Greece, or any other region with which they were acquainted. Both Solon and Plato studied in Egypt. The above account bears evidence on its face that it was taken from the sacred registers preserved in the temples of Egypt, and not invented by Solon or Plato. It is true that the foundation of Sais, as fixed by the priest, to wit, about 8600 B. C., appears to be extravagant in view of Manetho's chronology, which does not carry the *Achiiu*, or "saints," farther back than 5500 B. C.; but it must be remembered that he was giving a mythological date; for he was speaking of Neith or Athene, the goddess who loved war as well as wisdom. The point of interest here is that the Egyptians had accounts of the Deluge of Deucalion, and of many other floods, all of which were local and not universal, although the people concerned imagined they affected the whole earth. The discovery of the Pyramid Texts has furnished evidence, as astonishing as it was unexpected, of the truth of the statements of the Egyptian priest concerning the antiquity of the Athenians, or

Ionians, namely, "You do not know that there dwelt in your land the fairest and noblest race of men which ever lived," and "For there was a time, Solon, before that great deluge of all, when the city which is now Athens was first in war, and was pre-eminent for the excellency of her laws."

The inscriptions in the Pyramid of Teta, who mounted the throne 3146 B. C., speak of the two sisters of the deceased king, Isis and Nephthys, causing his soul to pass, in succession, *Kem-et ur-et* (near the present Lake of Crocodiles on the Suez Canal) in his name of *Kem-ur* (the Great Black) and *Anch Uaz-et ur-et*; that is, "the fortress of *Uaz-et ur-et*," in his name of *Uaz-ur*, "Great Green," or Mediterranean Sea; and the "Great Turn," or *Shen-et ur-et*, at the southeast bend of the Mediterranean, called the lake of *Shen-ur*, to finally "circle around" the great circle, at the northeast bend of the Mediterranean, which encircles (*pacher*) the *Ia-nim-u*, or Ionians. The name *Ia-nim-u* is written exactly as it was nearly three thousand years later in the Ptolemaic period, so that there can be no question whatever as to its meaning, for it was then translated "Ionians," or Greeks. But even if we did not know this from the inscriptions of the later period, the locality is so accurately pointed out that no mistake could be made in rendering the name *Ia-nim-u*. Isis and Nephthys conveyed the deceased along the great highway leading to Asia Minor. This great road at that time passed through the fortified town on Lake Timsah, which was then known as the "Great Black," in contradistinction to the "Great

Green," or Mediterranean. It will be remembered that *Sa-nuh-et* passed the fortified wall at this same place—the cherubim and flaming sword pointing every way, which was placed before the Garden of Eden, "to keep the *way* of the tree of life." After passing *Kem-ur*, the highway took a northerly direction along the east bank of the Bubastic arm of the Nile, until it reached the Mediterranean at the fortress bearing the same name; that is, the fortress of *Uaz-ur*. From this point the highway followed the Mediterranean in an easterly course until it reached the great bend at the lake of *Shen-ur*, "Great Bend," where the shore takes a direction almost due north. To this day the highway follows the shore of the sea northwardly, until it reaches the other great bend, where it is happily described as turning around, *de-benta shenet*, the circle which encompasses the Ionians. (Pyramid Texts, Teta, 274 and 275; Pepa I, 122; *Mer-en-ra I*, 91; Pepa II, 98, etc.) Of all the revelations contained in the sealed book of ancient Egypt, this is one of the most startling. Modern historians, who have invented a primeval seat for the Japhetic race in the highlands of Central Asia, from which they proceed to trace successive migrations to Europe in comparatively late times, will have to revise their works fundamentally; for the Ionians are shown by contemporary inscriptions to have been in Greece before the date of King Teta, or more than three thousand years before the Christian Era. Before I had seen the Pyramid Texts, I had noticed that Japheth was the Lower Egyptian form of *Ja-pet-u*,

the "foreign *Ia*." The hieroglyphic rendering of *Ia-nim-u* shows that the plural *nim*, "all," refers to a great nation, because it means, literally, the *Ia* "collectively," which can only apply to a people comprising many different nations. Consequently, when this term was first applied to the Ionians by the Egyptians, which was certainly before the reign of King *Teta*, they were the leading power in Europe.

Moses, who drew from Egyptian sources, speaking of the sons of *Iavan*, says: "By these were divided the islands of the Gentiles in their lands, every one according to his tongue, and their families in their nations,"—all of which is expressed by *Ia-nim-u*. To those Egyptologists who still insist that the literature of the Old and Middle Empire was destroyed and swept away by the Hyksos flood, I would say, that the above-mentioned fact alone demonstrates the truth of the statement made by the priest of Sais to Solon, that the remarkable events in Egypt, Greece, and other countries were written down of old and preserved in the temples. If it had not been so, he could not have known this about the primitive Ionians, for it is evident that Solon knew nothing about it, and that the Greeks generally had preserved no recollection of it.

There is no reason why a description of an actual local flood, supposed to have been universal, should not have served as the figure of an allegory, where the thing said is not the thing meant; but there are some features about the flood-story in Genesis which lead me to believe that it was originally taken from

an account of the inundation in Egypt, carried back to Asia by the '*Aamu* invaders, to whom it must have appeared as a miracle. Note the language of the priest to Solon, that in Egypt, neither at the time of the floods mentioned nor at any other, did the water come from above on the fields; but that it always had a tendency to come up from below. This was the mysterious periodical rising of the river without rains or any other visible cause. The water seemed to come up from the fountains of the deep. In Genesis we read, first, that all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and afterwards that the fountains of the deep were closed. These expressions pertain to Egypt and the Nile alone. The rain and the opening of the floodgates of heaven pertained to Babylonia. But the presence of the fountains of the deep, which related to the rising of the waters from below, show that Egypt was the land to which the story applied, for the expression is not applicable to Babylonia.

We are told that the water was fifteen cubits higher than the mountains which it covered. Why was the height above the mountains stated to be fifteen cubits? This number was certainly used for some purpose. If the flood had been universal, it would have been sufficient if all the mountains were covered, without regard to the exact depth. It will be seen at once that fifteen cubits can not apply to mountains in general, because they vary greatly in height. The water of the inundation, however, does cover the level, alluvial plains of Egypt to the depth of fifteen cubits, or twenty-two or twenty-three feet.

The annual rise of the Nile at Cairo is about twenty-three or twenty-four feet; but at Heliopolis, the recognized center of observation, it is about fifteen cubits. During the inundation the Egyptians retired within their cities, or arks, taking their beasts of the field, fowls of the air, crops, and provisions of all kinds with them, and they remained in these arks, resting safely above the waters, until the inundation subsided and the dry land appeared; when they naturally again went forth from their cities. If the reader should desire to investigate this subject more fully, and study the meaning of the symbols and figures used in Scriptures, the great work of L. A. Wood, now ready for publication, entitled, "Ancient Egypt, the Tree of Life," will afford the wished-for opportunity. This work presents the subject in a new light, and supplies a background of historical facts hitherto overlooked or forgotten, and will be found to be able, logical, and exhaustive, as well as original and interesting.

#### **FIFTEENTH DYNASTY OF ELEVEN DIOSPOLITAN KINGS**

We have already seen that the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Dynasties came to a close at the Hyksos Invasion; and that Manetho extended the Memphite kings two hundred and fifty-one years beyond that date, or down to 2097 B. C., the date of the beginning of the great Hyksos Dynasty.

The kings of the Thirteenth Dynasty have left few monuments which have survived to our times. I am not aware that any evidences of their rule have

been found at Bubastis, or Tanis, or, in fact, anywhere else in the Delta. The kings of the Fifteenth Dynasty, on the contrary, appear to have ruled over Egypt from Nubia to Tanis; and we are confronted with a state of things, during the first two hundred and fifty-one years of Hamite domination, diametrically opposed to that laid down in the modern textbooks on ancient Egypt. Here, as elsewhere, I propose to follow Manetho and the monuments as the most trustworthy guides, even though by so doing some old familiar theories may have to be abandoned.

We have been accustomed to look upon the Hyksos Invasion as a calamity, which almost destroyed the Egyptian nation, and completely blotted out Egyptian civilization. A closer inspection of Manetho's account will show that this opinion is wholly unfounded. He merely says that men of ignoble birth from the eastern parts had boldness enough to make an *expedition* into Egypt, and easily subdued it by force, for the Egyptians did not even hazard a battle with them; and that when they had gotten those who governed the Egyptians under their power, they burned the cities, demolished the temples, etc. Thus it was simply an *expedition* into Egypt by the army of the Hamite Government established in Elam. We have already called attention to the fact that the quotation of Josephus is but a fragment, and does not touch the first two hundred and fifty-one years of 'Aamu domination at all. We all know how Asiatic conquerors usually governed conquered countries. They invariably set up native kings of the royal line,

who exercised all the authority of kings, but were subject to the payment of an annual tribute. Fortunately, we know how this same Elamite Empire was governed and administered several centuries after the Hyksos conquest.

Chapter 14 of Genesis contains an account of a war made by Kudur-lagomar, king of the Elamites, and his associate kings, against the kings of Canaan. We are told that these kings had served Kudur-lagomar twelve years, and in the thirteenth year they revolted from him. In the fourteenth year Kudur-lagomar and the kings that were with him invaded Canaan, and ravaged the land to the confines of Egypt. Now, it is plain that the kings who accompanied Kudur-lagomar on this expedition, including Amraphel, King of Shinar (afterwards Babylonia), were subject kings, bearing the titles and exercising the local authority of kings. We are bound to infer that the entire territory between Elam and the Mediterranean Sea was governed by the King of Elam in this way, and that as long as the subject-kings paid the required tribute, they were not molested. Unless we indulge in speculation and conjecture, we can not escape the conclusion that when the king of the Elamites added Egypt to his empire, he administered it in the same way. It is difficult to accustom ourselves to the novel idea that, at the date of the supposed flood, 2348 B. C., there was an Elamite Empire in Western Asia, covering a greater extent of country than that governed by Cyrus 1,800 years later.

Strange as it may seem, the Hyksos conquest turned out to be, in some respects, an actual advantage to the Diospolitan kings. At the close of the Thirteenth Dynasty the Delta was divided up into a number of petty kingdoms, three of which were composed of foreigners settled and naturalized in Egypt. The brunt of the invasion struck the Delta, and the invaders "easily" accomplished (what the Theban kings could not accomplish) the destruction of the numerous petty governments in the Delta. The Theban kings of the Fifteenth Dynasty acknowledged themselves subject to the great ruler of the Hamites, and, backed up by his power, were able to exercise sovereignty over the Delta itself, as well as the territory governed by the Thirteenth Dynasty. Thus, the kings of the Fifteenth Dynasty were far more powerful than their predecessors of the Thirteenth Dynasty. Under Hamite protection, Tanis, near the northeastern angle of the Delta, became a favorite residence of the kings, and we shall see that some of their principal monuments were found at Tanis. It almost seems that the name *Sebku-hotep* was assumed by these kings in deference to "Sutech," or Typhonic Set, the chief deity of the Hamites.

The throne-title of the second king on fragment 81 of the papyrus, *Uah-ab-ra-Ian-ab*, fixes him unmistakably at the summer solstice of the Sothiac year 2064 B. C., and makes him the contemporary of the Hyksos king, *Pa-ian*. This important epoch-king was preceded on the same fragment by *Cha-hotep-ra*, who was one of the *Sebku-hoteps* specially

honored in the Table of Karnak. *Cha-hotep-ra* reigned but four years, eight months, and twenty-nine days, and, therefore, belongs to the Sixteenth Dynasty. We do not know how great the gap between fragment 81 and fragments 78 and 79 is, but the last king on these fragments is the *Sebku-hotep* who bore the throne-title *Cha-nofer-ra*. In the Table of Karnak, which omits all kings who are not in the direct genealogical line, there are two kings (*Cha-ka-ra*) and *Cha-anch-ra*, between *Cha-nofer-ra* and *Cha-hotep-ra*. The gap, therefore, may have contained five or six names. The two hundred and fifty-one years of this dynasty cover the Sothiac month of Tybi and the greater part of *Em-hir*, during which Horus is daily rising nearer and nearer to the highest point, the *ab* or *ian*, of his course in the upper hemisphere. For this reason we find titles compounded with *cha*, "rising," and *ab*, "heart" or "middle." I have already given my reasons for thinking that *Sochem-chu-tani-ra Sebku-hotep I* was the first king of the Fifteenth Dynasty. If this view be correct, we ought to find monuments of his reign in the Delta. Now remember that the preceding sixteen kings of the Thirteenth Dynasty, nine of whom appear on fragment 72 of the papyrus, have left no evidences of their reigns in the Delta, which corroborates and sustains Manetho throughout. *Sebku-hotep I* appears as a builder at Bubastis, where two lintel blocks bear his name. Is not this most remarkable? A Theban king, holding Memphis, and building temples at Bubastis, and, I might certainly

add, Tanis, shortly after the Hyksos conquest, proves beyond a doubt that Manetho followed the contemporary monuments and the ancient histories preserved in the temples when he included these kings among the "Memphite kings" who reigned from 3894 B. C. to 2097 B. C. The first king on fragments 78 and 79, *Se-mench-ka-ra Emir-meshau*, seems to have been a special favorite of the great Elamite king of *kings*. His name denotes that he was the general in command of the army; for *Emir*, erroneously rendered *mur* and *mer*, is the identical word "Emir" (ameer), used by the Turks to-day, just as Sublime Porte is a *literal* translation of *Per-ôa*, or Pharaoh. As this army was composed, in part at least, of Hamites, "*Emir-meshau*" must have enjoyed the special confidence of the great king in Elam. As we have just said, the Theban kings profited greatly by becoming the representatives of this overwhelming power in the East. Now for the evidence: Two large statues of this king were found at Tanis, and, what is equally significant, the great Hyksos king, Apophis, caused his name to be engraved on them. This king, no doubt, enjoyed a long and prosperous reign, and his two successors in the papyrus, whose names are almost entirely destroyed, do not seem to have belonged to the genealogical line.

*Sebku-hotep II*, known as *Sochem-s'uat-tai-ra*, has left a number of monuments, and, from all appearances, was as powerful as *Emir-meshau*.

His immediate successor, *Cha-seshat-ra* (*Chasis-atra?*) *Nofer-hotep* has also left beautiful statues and

other monuments, and, no doubt, ruled Egypt from Nubia to Tanis. His son, *Sa-hathor*, seems to have had but a short reign. His successor, *Sebku-hotep III Cha-nofer-ra*, whose place is fixed by the papyrus and the Table of Karnak also, certainly held Tanis, as his granite statue, which still lies there, testifies. He seems to have been the most powerful king of this dynasty, as colossal statues of him have been found in Nubia, above the third cataract. These kings knew how to adapt themselves to the whims and fancies of the Hamite monarchs, who were, intellectually, much their inferiors, and the statue of *Naram-sin* proves that the art of this dynasty was copied in Babylonia.

*Cha-ka-ra*, *Sebku-hotep IV*, and *Cha-anch-ra Sebku-hotep V*, of the Table of Karnak—the corresponding part of the papyrus is lost—belong to the decline of this dynasty. I know of no monuments of either of these kings found in the Delta. We are unable to say how many names are lost at the end of the fragment 79, following *Cha-nofer-ra*. Manetho had eleven kings in this dynasty, which gives us an average of about twenty-three years for each reign. The papyrus once contained the exact reign of each of these kings in *years, months, and days*, and likewise marked the epoch-kings of Tybi, 2304 B. C., and Emhir, 2184 B. C.; but this portion was torn off, and is lost. As there were but forty-four years between the beginning of this dynasty and the first epoch above named, it is possible that this epoch may have fallen near the end of fragment 76.

Manetho entered but one dynasty in his lists during this period. The pseudo-Sothis List has a Tanite Dynasty immediately before the Hyksos kings, which indicates that the Fifteenth Dynasty resided at Tanis, where they could be more effectually controlled by the Hamites. A systematic exploration of the ruins of Tanis may yet reveal many important facts concerning these kings and their immediate successors, the Hyksos kings.

#### **SIXTEENTH DYNASTY OF THIRTY-TWO THEBAID KINGS**

Following Manetho's order, we take up this dynasty before the Seventeenth, or Hyksos, Dynasty, both of which reigned contemporaneously for two hundred and sixty years, from 2097 B. C. to 1837 B. C.

The Sixteenth Dynasty was confined, like the early Eleventh Dynasty, to the Thebais. The tombs of its kings at Thebes succeed those of the Eleventh Dynasty, which makes it appear as if the Sixteenth Dynasty had immediately succeeded the Eleventh Dynasty.

Thebes seems to have had no school of artists prior to this time, and the monuments of this dynasty are, therefore, imitations of the rude works of the Eleventh Dynasty.

The great epoch of Phamenoth, 2064 B. C., when the sun of the Sothiac year, having reached the highest point, sometimes called the *ab*, or middle, of his course in the upper hemisphere, *turns*, and begins to descend, fell in the thirty-fourth year of this dynasty.

Fortunately, this portion of the papyrus, headed by *Cha-hotep-ra*, has survived, and we have the throne-titles of eight kings of this dynasty. The second king *Uah-ab-ra Ian-u-ab*, "The Mansion of the Heart of Ra" and "Turning the Heart," bears Sothiac titles marking him unmistakably as epoch-king of Phamenoth, 2064 B. C. His successor, whose reign *follows* the epoch, is designated as such by the words "*ari-en-ef em suteniu*," already explained, so that the chain of evidence is complete.

It seems that the first kings of this dynasty were the successors of the kings of the Fifteenth Dynasty, and that they were not immediately molested by the Hyksos kings. Saïtes lived at Memphis, and made both the upper and lower regions pay tribute. He also placed garrisons in the most proper positions. One of these garrisons, in my opinion, was placed at Koptos, near Thebes, thus confining the Sixteenth Dynasty strictly to the Thebais, as indicated by Manetho.

The last *Sebku-hotep*, *Cha-hotep-ra*, reigned four years, eight months, and twenty-nine days. His title indicates that the "Rising" of Ra was accomplished, that is, "at peace." *Uah-ab-ra*, or, as I read it, *Sochem-uah-ab-ra*, reigned ten years, eight months, and twenty-eight days, which, I contend, extends to 2064 B. C.

*Mer-nofer-ra*, meaning "Loving the Perfection of Ra," reigned thirteen years, eight months, and eighteen days. As we have demonstrated, Horus attained his "perfection" at the summer solstice, when he be-

came *Ra*, and this title is equally as significant as the others.

These kings do not seem to have incurred the ill-will of the Hyksos monarchs; but the short reigns of their immediate successors point to war and disorder. *Mer-hotep-ra* reigned two years, two months, and nine days; *S'anch-en-ra*, three years, two months, and ten days; *Mer-sochem-ra*, three years, one month, and ten days, etc. These reigns, compared to the forty-four years of *Pa-ian* and the sixty-one years of Apophis I, demonstrate, more plainly than words possibly could, the absolute truth of Manetho's statement: "And these six were the first rulers among them, who were all along making war with the Egyptians, and were very desirous gradually to destroy them to the very roots."

The kings of the Fifteenth Dynasty enjoyed the semblance of royalty, and, at home, were more powerful than their predecessors of the Thirteenth Dynasty had been. Neither the people nor the Pharaohs had any cause to complain of the sovereign in far-off Elam; but the condition of the unfortunate Theban "hyks" of the Sixteenth Dynasty was humiliating and miserable indeed, and led to constant friction and disturbance.

After *Mer-nofer-ra*, the papyrus shows us a series of kings who merely appear upon the throne to be hurled down again by the Hamite tyrants. Among these are two, *Mer-hotep-ra* and *Mer-sochem-ra*, who appear in the Table of Karnak. We need not wonder,

therefore, that Manetho assigned thirty-two kings to this dynasty.

Notwithstanding these unfavorable conditions, we find that all these reigns were carefully registered, even when they did not exceed a few months and days. The period of greatest depression must have been under Apophis I, for later on we find some reigns of normal length. Manetho opens his account of the Hyksos Dynasty by telling us that the first king, Saites, fortified the eastern frontier, *foreseeing* that the Babylonians would be desirous of that kingdom, and *invade* them. This language, coming from such a careful, truthful, and conservative authority, was certainly, by way of introduction to an account, farther on in his history, of an *invasion* of the Hyksos kingdom by the king of the Elamites and his subject-kings, such as the king of Shinar (afterwards Babylonia), etc. If such an invasion had not taken place, Manetho would not have used the word "*foreseeing*." While the Hyksos forces were employed and weakened in defending the Delta from foreign attack, the kings of Thebes enjoyed a period of comparative peace, during which they were able to recruit their strength, and prepare for the coming struggle. To the beginning of this dynasty we may assign the following monumental kings:

1. *Sochem-uat-chau-ra Sebku-em-sa-uf.*

This king heads the third section of the right half of the Table of Karnak, and follows immediately after the *Sebku-hotops* of the Fifteenth Dynasty. *Cha,*

“rising,” is still an element in his throne-title, but we must not forget that there were thirty-three years of the month of *Emhir* (2097 to 2064 B. C.) in this dynasty, and that the fourteen years of *Cha-hotep-ra* and *Sochem-uah-ab-ra*, the latter of whom “turned the heart of Ra,” leave the first nineteen years, corresponding to the nineteen years of Saïtes, unprovided for. I follow the Table of Karnak in giving this king the first place, although we know that the most distinguished series are grouped around the standing figures of Thothmes III, and the less noted kings arranged around them at random. The tomb of this king was at Thebes, and, although its location is not known, Arabs must have found it, for objects usually buried with the mummy have been sold, and remain to attest the fact. The throne-title of this king, its form and arrangement, and the element *Sebku* in his name, all show that he immediately succeeded the last king of the Fifteenth Dynasty.

2. *Sochem-uah-chau-ra Ra-hotep*.

A broken tablet, set up by this king, was found at Koptos. But as this dynasty was set up by the Hyksos kings, to govern the Land of the South and collect and pay over the revenues, there would be no inconsistency in the king restoring the temple of *Men* at Koptos, and setting up a memorial of the fact.

3. *Sochem-shedi-taui-ra Sebku-em-sa-uf*.

The royal commission appointed by Ramesses X (?) reported that it had examined the tomb of this king at Thebes, and that it had been broken into, and the mummy destroyed. It is probable that this

king ought to be placed *after* the kings named on fragment 81 of the papyrus, beginning with *Cha-hotep-ra*, whose position, chronologically, admits of no doubt, because inscriptions of a much later date mention the fourteenth year of King *Ra-hotep*.

The thieves who had rifled the tomb of *Sebku-em-sauf* confessed that, when they had effected an entrance, they found the sepulchral chamber protected by masonry and covered with roofing. After these had been destroyed, they opened the sarcophagi and coffins in which the mummies of the king and queen had reposed for nearly nine centuries. Beside the mummy of the king they found his divine ax. The head was overlaid with gold, and the body, also, was covered with gold. Around the neck were many amulets and ornaments of gold. The coffins were burnished with gold and inlaid with precious stones. The thieves stole everything that was valuable, including the vases of gold, silver, and bronze, and other tomb furniture, and then set fire to the coffins. Is it a wonder that, in all after ages, the royal tombs continually excited the cupidity of such sacrilegious wretches as these?

4. *Sochem-nofer-chau-ra Up-uat-em-sauf*.

It is probable that the throne-title of this king was among the destroyed ovals of the Table of Karnak. In type it is closely related to the foregoing. In form it seems to precede *Cha-hotep-ra*, for *Nofer-chau*, which indicates that the "Rising" of Ra was "perfected" when this king was crowned, is but another form of *Cha-hotep-ra*.

The name itself, "Upon the way as Saviour," reminds us of the Eleventh Dynasty. It was natural for these kings, who were brought into direct contact with the memorials of the Theban rulers of the Eleventh Dynasty, to pattern their names and titles after those of the first Theban rulers.

According to the author of Genesis, Noah, or Thebes, survived three hundred and fifty years after the Flood. We might be tempted to assume that this number was two hundred and fifty years originally, although the total of nine hundred and fifty years for the entire duration of the first Theban Government requires three hundred and fifty years.

The fragments of the papyrus show no break between the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Dynasties. When Saïtes was made king of Egypt, with Memphis as his capital, the old line was simply forced back into the Thebaid. But it is probable that, one hundred years later, or about 1997 B. C., a collateral line from El-kab, or vicinity, supplanted the original Theban line. It would almost appear as if Apophis I, about this time, had taken possession of Thebes and suppressed the old line. It is certain that the later kings of this dynasty had some connection with the great fortress of el-Kab, the walls of which, more than twelve yards thick, inclosed a square, each side of which was more than six hundred and fifty yards in length. There were wars between the Hyksos kings and Theban rulers before the great insurrection mentioned by Manetho. Theban successes led to the insurrection, which occurred under Apophis II,

the last Hyksos king. *Se-kennen-ra* and Apophis II both bore the title *Ôa-ken-en*, which is a strong indication of contemporaneity.

Towards the close of this dynasty I am inclined to place the following monumental kings, under whom the rule of Thebes was extended northwardly beyond Abydos:

1. *Neb-cher-ra* Menthuhotep.

It was formerly supposed that this king belonged to the Eleventh Dynasty, but the formation of his titles does not agree with this hypothesis. He was a powerful and aggressive ruler. During his long and vigorous reign of forty-one years, Upper Egypt was restored to power and confidence, and the foundations of the War of Liberation were laid and cemented. After-ages singled him out as the great hero of the period, and his name was placed alongside those of Mena, Senoferu, and Aahmes. The royal commission above mentioned examined his brick pyramid, at Thebes, and found it to be intact. The reign of this king apparently coincides with the first forty years of the reign of the Hyksos king, *Cha-ian*, Manetho's "Iannos."

2. *Nub-cheper-ra* Antef.

The last five kings in the Table of Karnak are:

*Neb-cher-ra*

*Nub-cheper-ra*

*User-en-ra* (comp. *Se-user-en-ra*)

*Se-necht-en-ra* and

*Se-ken-en-ra*

These five, I am convinced, represent a genealog-

ical series. Thus fragment 63 of the papyrus contains, in immediate succession, *Neb-cher-ra* and *Se-user-en-ra*.

As might have been foreseen, we find *Nub-cheper-ra* Antef active at Koptos, where he deposed a high official for harboring *enemies* in the temple. Is it not probable that these enemies were Hyksos?

The tomb of this king was among those visited and inspected by the commission of Ramesses X. It was found to be uninjured. The names Mentuhotep and Antef need not astonish us here; they appear again and again during the Hyksos period, and were assumed by these kings to inspire awe and respect.

### 3. *Se-user-en-ra*.

This title is written *User-en-ra* in the Table, but this may be a mistake, owing to the following name having the initial *Se*. The Hyksos king, *Cha-ian*, bore the same throne-title, to wit, *Se-user-en-ra*, which, of itself, marks them as contemporaries. I place this short reign towards the close of *Cha-ian's* reign.

### 4. *Se-necht-en-ra*.

No monuments of this king have yet been found.

### 5. *Se-ken-en-ra*.

There were several kings who bore this title. A separate tomb of *Se-ken-en-ra Ta-ôa*, that is, "*Ta*, the Great," is mentioned in the Abbott papyrus. The tomb of *Se-ken-en-ra Ta-ôa-ôa*, that is, "*Ta*, the Very Great," also mentioned in this papyrus, and separately examined by the commission, belongs, in my opinion,

to *Ta-ôa-ken*, "*Ta*, the Great and Brave," for *ôa-ôa* is augmentative only, and equivalent to *ôa-ken*.

The mummy of *Ta-ôa-ken*, showing the marks of deadly wounds received on the field of battle, was found at Deir-el-bahri, and can now be seen in the Cairo Museum. His antagonist, Apophis II, bore the same title, *Ôa-ken*.

#### THE HYKSOS DYNASTY OF SIX KINGS

We have just followed the Sixteenth Dynasty of Theban kings from 2097 B. C. to 1837 B. C. Let us now retrace our steps, go back to 2097 B. C., and take up the great Hyksos Dynasty of six kings, which reigned contemporaneously with the Sixteenth Dynasty. After describing the Hamite invasion, Manetho says:

"At length they made one of themselves king, whose name was Saïtes; he also lived at Memphis, and made both the upper and lower regions pay tribute, and left garrisons in places that were the most proper for them. He chiefly aimed to secure the eastern parts, foreseeing that the Assyrians, who then had the greatest power, would be desirous of that kingdom, and invade them; and, as he found in the Saïte nome a city very proper for his purpose, and which lay upon the Bubastic channel, but, with regard to a certain theologic notion, was called Avaris, this he rebuilt, and made very strong by the walls he built about it, and by a most numerous garrison of 240,000 armed men, whom he put into it to keep it. Thither Saïtes came in the summer time, partly to gather his corn and pay his soldiers their wages, and partly to exercise his armed men and thereby to terrify foreigners."

We have already seen how loyal the Fifteenth Dynasty was to the king of the Elamites, and that the establishment of a dynasty in Egypt by the Hyksos was equivalent to a declaration of independence upon their part. It was for this reason that Saïtes, or *Seth*, found it necessary to rebuild and fortify Avaris, and to put into it a garrison of 240,000 men. Manetho leaves us in no doubt as to the purpose of this; for he tells us that Saïtes aimed to secure the eastern frontier, foreseeing that the Elamites and their Babylonian subjects, here called Assyrians, would be desirous of his kingdom, and invade it, and further, that Saïtes publicly exercised his great force of 240,000 armed men to terrify foreigners. I repeat this because it is generally assumed, I can not see why, that this immense army was maintained in order to terrify and hold in subjection the native Egyptians. It is true that he left garrisons in the most proper places for them in Egypt, but it is equally true that he did not apprehend much danger from that side. Although two hundred and fifty-one years had elapsed since the original Hamite Invasion of 2348 B. C., the foreigners settled in the Delta were still the dominating element in Egypt, and we are surprised to find them numerous enough to furnish such armies.

This dynasty is the Biblical Mizraim. It is remarkable that Moses calls Mizraim a son of Ham, and not a son of *No-ôa*, or Thebes. This is because the Hyksos Government was not derived from the Theban Government, but from the Hamite, which

was established at Tanis, on the Egyptian model, one hundred years before the Flood. Saïtes, therefore, although Hamite by race, was a genuine Egyptian Pharaoh, holding his court at the old capital, Memphis, and in opposition to the Suzerain in distant Elam. Assyriologists have discovered inscriptions which place the date of *Kudur-nanchundi*, an Elamite conqueror, at about 2286 B. C. When *Assurbanipal* took Susiana, the capital of Elam, about 651 B. C., he brought back from that city an image of Ishtar, which had been carried off from the city of Erech by *Kudur-nanchundi*. He tells us that the goddess Ishtar had been desecrated, and dwelt in a place unsuitable for her, for 1,635 years. This number, which carries us back to about 2286 B. C., shows that the Babylonians, in the time of Assurbanipal had records which were considered to be accurate enough to fix, within a year, the date of this ancient event. In fact, although 2286 B. C. appears very ancient to us, 1,635 years may not have been so regarded by the scribes and learned men of Babylonia.

Thus we find that, about sixty-two years after the 'Aamu conquest of Egypt, an Elamite king, bearing a name very similar to that of Kudur-lagomar, was in possession of Erech, in Babylonia, a city mentioned as one of the capitals of Nimrod, the grandson of Ham. We are accustomed to identify Elam with Persia, but the name *Elamu* turns out to be a literal translation of Akkadians, or "Highlanders." The 'Aamu came from the highlands, east of Babylonia, and took possession of the plains of Babylonia. They

fixed their capital at Shushan, or Susiana. The principal nation among them was called Kashi, Kushi, Kossi, Kissi, etc. When we read of the Akkadians, Akkadian language, and Akkadian literature, therefore, we must bear in mind that Elam and Akkad are synonymous, and that Kush is a "son of Ham."

At the time of the Hamite invasion of Egypt there was, in Western Asia, an empire with its capital in Elam, dominating an expanse of territory larger than that subjected by Cyrus. It is hard for any one, who has been trained from early infancy to believe in the destruction of mankind by a literal flood of waters, to accept, and accustom himself to, this fact. The Elamites, or *'Aamu*, ruled this entire region about 1921 B. C., when Abraham migrated, unmolested, from Ur of the Chaldees to Canaan. The recent discovery of the Tel-el-Amarna clay-tablets proves that as late as 1650 B. C. the language and writing of Babylonia were in general use in Canaan. According to Eusebius, Berossos called the invaders "Medes," and assigned to them two dynasties, the first of which had eight kings, who reigned two hundred and twenty-four years, and the second of which had eleven kings, who reigned forty-eight years. I venture to predict that the last number was originally one hundred and forty-eight years, which would place the beginning of Median, or Elamite, domination over Babylonia at 2348 B. C., the same year in which the Elamite conquest of Egypt took place.

The reader will pardon this digression, which was necessary to establish the literal truth of Manetho's

statement that the Assyrians, meaning the Elamites and their allies, then had the greatest power in Asia, that is, about 2097 B. C. The capture of Erech by Kudur-nanchundi, about 2286 B. C., will also throw a welcome ray of light upon the expedition into Egypt, made by these same people sixty-two years before that date, and assist us in freeing our minds of many erroneous impressions in regard to the so-called Hyksos conquest of Egypt, which differed but little from the so-called Median conquest of Babylonia.

Before pursuing this subject further, we will now address ourselves to the exact chronology of this dynasty, which (thanks to the excellent list transmitted by Josephus, although with some errors as to the names and the order of the kings), is as accurate as that of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. We now give the Lists of Africanus, Josephus, and Eusebius, and the pseudo-Sothis List:

LIST OF AFRICANUS

|                       | Years.  | Months. |
|-----------------------|---------|---------|
| 1. Saitea, . . . . .  | 19      |         |
| 2. Beon, . . . . .    | 44      |         |
| 3. Pachnan, . . . . . | 61      |         |
| 4. Staan, . . . . .   | 50      |         |
| 5. Archles, . . . . . | 49      |         |
| 6. Aphobia, . . . . . | (36) 61 |         |

LIST OF JOSEPHUS

|                                |    |   |
|--------------------------------|----|---|
| 1. Salatis (Saitea), . . . . . | 19 |   |
| 2. Beon (Baian), . . . . .     | 44 |   |
| 3. Apachnas, . . . . .         | 36 | 7 |
| 4. Apophis, . . . . .          | 61 |   |
| 5. Ianias, . . . . .           | 50 | 1 |
| 6. Assis, . . . . .            | 49 | 2 |

|  | Years. | Months. |
|--|--------|---------|
| LIST OF EUSEBIUS   |        |         |
| 1. Saïtes, . . . . .   | 19     |         |
| 2. Beon (Bnon), . . . . .  | 40     |         |
| 3. Aphophis, . . . . .   | 14     |         |
| 4. Archles, . . . . .  | 30     |         |
| PSEUDO-SOTHIS LIST   |        |         |
| 1. Silites, the first of the six kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty, according to Manetho, . . . . . | 19     |         |
| 2. Baion, . . . . .  | 44     |         |
| 3. Apachnas, . . . . .   | 36     |         |
| 4. Aphophis, . . . . .   | 61     |         |
| 5. Sethos, . . . . .   | 50     |         |
| 6. Kertos, . . . . .   | 29     |         |
| 7. Aseth, . . . . .  | 20     |         |

Although all of these lists have been changed, more or less, each of them has preserved at least one important item not to be found in the others. Notwithstanding these changes, Saïtes and Ba-ion are the first two kings in all the lists. We have already shown that this dynasty commenced to reign about 2097 B. C. The great epoch of Phamenoth, when the sun *reversed* his course, fell in the year 2064 B. C., or thirty-three years later. Now, as Saïtes reigned nineteen years, a simple calculation will show that the first fourteen years of Ba-ion's reign belong to the month of Emhir—the month of *rohk-ur*, "great heat;" and the remaining thirty years of his reign to Phamenoth—the month of *rohk-nes*, or *rohk-les*, "little heat." Thus this great epoch-king was entitled to such epoch-titles as *Pa-ian* (Die Wende) and Rochles, "Little Heat." Fortunately, the forger of the pseudo-Sothis List, and Eusebius also, often used epoch-reigns in preference to real reigns, when

they happened to suit their chronological schemes. Eusebius followed the so-called Old (?) Chronicle, which gave the Hyksos Dynasty only one hundred and three years. After entering Saïtes with nineteen years and Beon with forty years, he gives Apophis, who reigned sixty-one years, the fourteen years of *Paian before* the epoch, followed by Rochles, "Little Heat," with the thirty years of *Pa-ian after* the epoch. This accurate Sothiac division of *Pa-ian's* reign did not originate with Eusebius, but was copied, by some one, from Manetho. We have just seen that the reign of *Uah-ab-ra Ian-ab* was divided in the same way by the author of the Turin papyrus prior to 1584 B. C. I imagine that Manetho's chronological list presented some such form as this:

|   |          |        |
|---|----------|--------|
| Saïtes, . . . . .                       | 19 years |        |
| <i>Pa-ian</i> , before epoch, . . . . . | 14 years | } 44 " |
| <i>Pa-ian</i> , as "Rochles," . . . . . | 30 "     |        |

At first view, Archles and *Rohk-nes* seem to have little in common, but it is very easy to follow the successive steps of the transformation. *Rohk-ur* was transformed into Rokchoris, preserving both the *k* and *ch* sounds. In certain combinations *n* became *l* in certain Egyptian words: for instance, Manetho transcribes Utnas, "Utlas." We can assume that he, in the same manner, converted Rochnes into "Rochles." The transcribers and copyists did the rest. Did not Josephus, innocently enough, convert Ramesses into "Armesses?" Applying the same evolutionary process to Rochles, we have, *first*, Arochles, and, finally (dropping the *o*), "Archles."

In this particular instance the transformation admits of no doubt, otherwise there are many who might feel inclined, for special reasons, to question it. There were two epochs in this dynasty, and the epoch-reigns have been the principal cause of most of the confusion now apparent in the lists, for, as there were but six kings in the dynasty, each epoch-title inserted in the lists necessarily crowded out the name of one of the kings.

The ancient division of the reign of Ba-ion by the epoch 2064 B. C., proves that the date 2097 B. C. for the beginning of the dynasty is astronomically correct.

The fact that Eusebius, after entering Baion separately, gave the first fourteen years of his reign to Apophis, shows that Apophis was the third king, who reigned sixty-one years. When we analyze the strange conglomerate "Apachnas," it resolves itself into the initial Ap, of Apophis, and Archnas, afterwards further corrupted into Achnas. Apachnas, therefore, is simply a blending of Apophis and Rachnas, which Manetho may have given in the two forms, Rochnas and Rochles. We find that Africanus (although some one has changed his list by substituting "Pachnan" for Apophis) gives the third king, Apophis I, whose throne-title was *Ôa-user-ra*, a reign of sixty-one years. The epoch-reigns demonstrate that this was his correct reign, and that the thirty-six years and seven months given to the third king, Apachnes, in the List of Josephus and in the pseudo-Sothis List, belong to Apophis II, the last king of

this dynasty. The question arises: How could Josephus make this mistake if he actually copied the list from the second book of Manetho's history? It will be seen that Josephus gives Apophis sixty-one years, although he places him fourth instead of third. It will also be seen that two epoch-titles, Rochles, now Apachnas, and Asas, now Assis, have found their way into the List of Josephus, necessarily crowding out the names of two of the kings, to wit, Sethos and Apophis II. Now, it is evident that the original six reigns had to be preserved intact in order to foot up the required total of two hundred and fifty-nine years and ten months. As these mistakes could not have existed in Manetho's work, it follows that Josephus used an extract from Manetho's work made by some one else. Before we take up the last three reigns, the reader will notice that the pseudo-Sothis List divides the reign of forty-nine years and two months, given by Africanus to Archles, and by Josephus to Assis, into two parts, to wit, Kertos, twenty-nine years, and Aseth, twenty years. In this list, and the list of Josephus also, Apachnas has displaced Apophis; consequently Sethos, who follows Apophis, must likewise be out of place. The name Sethos, Kertos, Assis, and Aseth represent but two names originally, namely, *Set* and *As-as*.

In the list of Africanus, Staas, who follows Apophis, was originally *Set-aan*, the Sethos of the pseudo-Sothis List, and the *an-nub* . . . of fragment 112 of the Turin papyrus. Thus Sethos, the *Set-an* (Satan) of Africanus, was the fourth king of this dynasty, and

follows Apophis I. This is verified to a certainty by the division of his reign into twenty-nine years before, and twenty years after, the epoch of Pharmuthi, 1944 B. C.

|                                   |          |   |          |            |
|-----------------------------------|----------|---|----------|------------|
| Epoch of Phamenoth, . .           |          |   |          | 2064 B. C. |
| Archles, . . . . .                | 30 years |   |          |            |
| Apophis I <i>Ôa-user</i> , . . .  | 61       | " |          |            |
| Sethos, before epoch, . .         | 29       | " |          | 120        |
|                                   |          |   |          | <hr/>      |
| Epoch of Pharmuthi, . .           |          |   |          | 1944 B. C. |
| Sethos, after epoch, as           |          |   |          |            |
| <i>Asas</i> , . . . . .           | 20       | " | 2 months |            |
| Ianias, . . . . .                 | 50       | " | 1        | "          |
| Apophis II <i>Ôa-ken-en</i> , . . | 36       | " | 7        | "          |
| Aahmes, as Chebros, . . .         | 13       | " | 2        | "          |
|                                   |          |   |          | 120        |
|                                   |          |   |          | <hr/>      |
| Epoch of Pachons, . . .           |          |   |          | 1824 B. C. |

We have already seen that *As*, "ancient," and *As-as* (Assis), "very ancient," are titles applied to Ra, after he has passed the zenith, and begins to approach the western horizon. The epoch-king of 3404 B. C. bore the title Psamuthis, and we have already explained how it was derived and what it means. It is evident that Assis and Aseth are simply forms of the epoch-title of Sethos, who was the celebrated *Set-nub-ti* of the "Tablet of Four Hundred Years."

The last king in the list of Africanus is Apophis, but, by mistake or subsequent change, he has the sixty-one years of Apophis I instead of his own reign of thirty-six years. We now know from the Sallier papyrus that the name of the last Hamite king, who reigned contemporaneously with *Taa-ôa-ken*, was Apophis.

The fifth king, Iantias, the immediate predecessor of Apophis II, has materialized in a most unexpected manner. A seated statue of an Egyptian Pharaoh was recently discovered at Bubastis by Naville. It bears the name of *Chian*, or *Cha-ian*, which was first read *Ra-ian*, by mistaking the sign of the sieve for the sign of the sun, both of which are circles very much alike. His throne-title, as king of Upper and Lower Egypt, was *Se-user-en-ra*, which we have already alluded to in the Sixteenth Dynasty. The name of this king has also come down to us on two cylinders and a number of scarabs, where it sometimes appears as *Sa-ra Cha-ian* and *Hyk-satu Cha-ian*. I have already explained that *Hyk-satu* means "King of foreign countries," and is the title rendered *Hyksos* by Manetho. Petrie, therefore, is in error when he seeks to place this king between the Sixth and Twelfth Dynasties. The style of the statue stamps it as a work of the Hyksos period, for it differs but little in style and design from the well-known statues of the kings of the Fifteenth Dynasty.

We have seen that in the Table of Karnak the last three kings in the genealogical line are *Se-user-en-ra*, *Se-necht-en-ra*, and *Se-ken-en-ra*, and that the two kings bearing the title *Se-user-en-ra* must have been contemporaries.

Now, let us see how the above chronological arrangement agrees with the monuments. We have an excellent description of Saïtes from Manetho, and he appears simply as *Set* on fragment 150 of the Turin papyrus. It is probable that, like *Unas* and *Teta*, he

bore no other title. The name *Set* was assumed in honor of the Hamite and Cushite deity, Sutech, who thus usurped the place of Ra. Baion, Beon, etc., stand for *Pa-ian*, the epoch-title of the second king; but it is not certain that this was his name; his throne-title on fragment 150 of the papyrus is *Annu*. . . . Apophis I is distinguished by the throne-title *Ôa-user*.

Sethos is mentioned in the "Tablet of Four Hundred Years," where his name is written *Set-nubti*, and his throne-title *Ôa-pahu-ti*. I am convinced that *Set-nubti*, the Nubian Set, or golden Set, is synonymous with *Set-an*, for the reason that the inhabitants of Nubia were called the *An*. It seems that the Egyptian *Set* and the Hamite Sutech, when blended, became *Set-nubti* or *Set-an*—that is, Typhonic *Set*—the adversary of Osiris, who was, therefore, identified with *Apap*, or *Apophis*, the giant snake, the Egyptian symbol of wickedness. All this agrees perfectly with the fact that the Hamite invaders of Egypt were serpent-worshipers.

According to the pseudo-Sothis List, Aseth—that is, Sethos—the epoch-king, added five intercalary days to the year. If so, the invaders must have used a year of three hundred and sixty days prior to that time. Be this as it may, he is now known to have done more than this, for he established an era, known as the era of King *Set-nubti*, which dated from the epoch 1944 B. C. In the beginning of the reign of Ramesses II, shortly after the death of Seti I, ten Sothiac weeks, or four hundred years, had elapsed since this era was established, and the "Tablet of Four

Hundred Years" was set up in the year 1544 B. C., to commemorate this important event. History repeats itself, as we shall see, for Solomon's temple was erected twelve Sothiac weeks, or four hundred and eighty years, after the Exodus, so that there were nine hundred and thirty-three years from the era of *Set-nubti* to the building of the temple.

I attach a great deal of importance to the fact that the reformation of the year is ascribed to Ases, and not to Sethos, because this shows that it dates from the epoch, and not from the beginning of the reign of Sethos. The four hundred years of the tablet also prove that the era was connected with a Sothiac epoch, for the Sothiac year, or cycle, was divided into Sothiac months of one hundred and twenty years, and these months were again divided into Sothiac weeks of forty years.

We need not repeat that this tablet with ten Sothiac weeks conclusively demonstrates that the Hyksos Dynasty of six kings, which reigned two hundred and fifty-nine years and ten months, was not succeeded by another Hyksos period of two hundred and fifty-one years, as Josephus, or the epitomists from whom he copied, would lead us to believe. Is this the reason that the tablet, like other monuments of the same import, disappeared so soon after its discovery? There are necessarily one hundred and twenty years between this era and the epoch of Pachons, 1824 B. C. Manetho gave the Eighteenth Dynasty, to the death of Seti I, two hundred and sixty-three years after this epoch. Thus there were

exactly three hundred and eighty-three years from the era of *Set-nubti* to the death of Seti I, and the tablet was erected in the eighteenth year of the reign of Ramesses II. Could anything be plainer? Are we not face to face with a mathematical demonstration? And yet there were many who doubted the discoveries of Copernicus and Newton.

Suppose, for example, you were to place a period of two hundred and fifty-one years between the Hyksos Dynasty and the Eighteenth Dynasty, you would have :

|  |           |   |
|--|-----------|---|
| From era to end of Hyksos Dynasty, . . . . . | 107 years |   |
| Assumed period, . . . . .                    | 251       | " |
| Chebros, . . . . .                           | 13        | " |
| Eighteenth Dynasty, . . . . .                | 263       | " |
|  | <hr/>     |   |
| Total, . . . . .                             | 634       | " |

These figures require no commentary. By placing the period of two hundred and fifty-one years before the two hundred and sixty years of the Hyksos Dynasty, we have five hundred and eleven years for the Hamite domination, and four hundred years from the era of *Set-nubti* to the eighteenth year of Ramesses II, by whose order the tablet was erected.

These four hundred years are significant in another respect: they correspond approximately to the four hundred and thirty years between the arrival of Abram in Canaan, which event is correctly fixed by the Bible chronographers at 1921 B. C., and the Exodus, which, I am prepared to say, occurred about 1491 B. C.

Abram visited Egypt in the beginning of the reign of the Hyksos King *Cha-ian*—that is, about twenty-three years after the epoch which served as the beginning point of the era of *Set-nubti*, and the period of four hundred and thirty years extends fifty-three years beyond the period of four hundred years. The behavior of Pharaoh toward his guest was contrary to Egyptian manners, but perfectly in accord with Hamite customs. George Smith ("Assyrian Discoveries," page 421) describes a stone lion found in an excavation at Bagdad. The name and titles of *Set-nubti* are carved on the breast of this sphinx. Smith supposed that *Set-nubti* was the monarch called Saïtes by Manetho; but this is an evident mistake. The lion corroborates Manetho and the Tablet of Four Hundred Years as to the reign of the Hyksos King Sethos.

Ionias, or Iannas, is no longer a mere name, since the seated statue of Bubastis has come to light. When Abram and his picturesque company from distant Chaldea appeared before *Chaian*, the latter had just commenced his long reign of fifty years and one month, and shone forth in all the splendor and magnificence of youthful strength and vigor. It is not probable that Asia at this time heard much of the tributary *Hyks* at Thebes, and yet I am satisfied that the Hyksos Government suffered a severe reverse near the close of the reign of Apophis I, and that the subjection of Canaan by Kudur-lagomar and the migration of Abram's family were closely connected with it. According to the numbers of Berossos, the second Median Dynasty was succeeded by Babylonian

kings about 1976 B. C., or three years before the accession of *Set-nubti*.

Apophis II, *Ôa-ken-en*, was the sixth and last king of this dynasty. He caused his name and titles to be carved on the right shoulder of the statues of *Emir-meshau*, lying among the ruins of Tanis. As we have remarked hereinabove, this fact indicates that the Hyksos kings regarded their predecessors of the Fifteenth Dynasty with no special ill-will; otherwise they would not have tolerated their statues in the temples at Tanis. A granite altar of this king, now in the Cairo Museum, contains his Horus and throne titles, to wit: *Har Se-hotep tauî*, King, etc., *Ôa-ken-en-ra*. In the inscription upon it, he claims to have erected monuments to his father, "*Set, Lord of Avaris*" (*Set, neb Haet-uar-et*), which is important in connection with the statements of the Sallier papyrus in the British Museum:

"It came to pass that the land of Kemi was a prey to the enemies. And no one was lord or king at that time. There was, indeed, a king, *Seken-en-ra*, at that time; but he was only a *hyk* of the city of the south. And the enemies in the cities were the *'Aamu*, and Apophis was king in the city of Avaris. And the whole land brought him its productions, and the north country likewise with the good things of *Tamera*. And the king, Apophis, chose *Set* as his divine lord, and he did not serve any other god of the whole land except *Set*. He built for him a temple of glorious work to last for ages. And King Apophis appointed feasts and days upon which to offer sacrifice to *Set*, and the chiefs of the king wore garlands, as is done in the temples of Ra Harmachis."

It may be that the granite altar above-mentioned was dedicated to *Set*, and placed in this identical temple. Apophis II seems to have gone farther than any of his predecessors in his devotion to the Hamite deity, Sutech, or Set. He not only chose Sutech as his "lord god" (a purely Hamite notion), but refused to worship any other god.

The "enemies" who had established themselves in the Delta are expressly called '*Aamu*. Apophis, their king, seems to have abandoned Memphis, and to have made Avaris his capital.

Brugsch understood the papyrus to state that the tyrant Apophis had sent messages to *Seken-en-ra*, requiring the latter to worship Sutech alone, and give up the worship of the Egyptian gods. No doubt this was the straw that broke the camel's back. Of course, *Seken-en-ra* could not, dare not, obey this order. To worship Sutech, or *Set-an*, instead of *Amen*, would be equivalent at Thebes to worshiping Satan. *Seken-en-ra*'s refusal to give up the worship of *Amen* excited the animosity of the tyrant of Avaris, and he sought a pretext for war. The papyrus further relates that many days after these events King Apophis sent to the Hyk of the city of the South a certain message, which his scribes had drawn up for him. When the messenger had delivered the message, *Seken-en-ra* asked him: "Who hath sent thee hither to this city of the South? Art thou come in order to spy out?"

For a long time the unfortunate Hyk was troubled so that he could not answer the messenger of King Apophis. After he had replied and the messenger

had departed, he called his great men and his captains and generals under him, and communicated to them all the messages which the tyrant Apophis had sent him. But they were all silent through great grief, and did not know what to answer.

It is plain that they all understood that war, with all its horrors, was at the door. Although the papyrus breaks off at this point, there can be no doubt that the subject of the composition was the great war of liberation, and that what we have was merely introductory to this war. We now supply an outline of the remainder from Manetho as transmitted by Josephus:

“After these, he says that the kings of the Thebais and of the other parts of Egypt made an insurrection against the Hyksos, and that a terrible and long war was made between them. He says further that, under a king whose name was Alisphragmuthosis, the Hyksos were subdued by him, and were, indeed, driven out of other parts of Egypt, but were shut up in a place that contained ten thousand acres; this place was named Avaris. Manetho says that the shepherds built a wall round all this place, which was a large and strong wall, and this in order to keep all their possessions and their prey within a place of strength; but that Thummosis, the son of Alisphragmuthosis, made an attempt to take them by force and by siege, with 480,000 men to lie round about them; but that, upon his despair of taking the place by that siege, they came to a composition with them, that they should leave Egypt, and go without any harm to be done them, whithersoever they would; and that, after this composition was made, they went away with their whole families and effects not fewer in number than

240,000, and took their journey from Egypt, through the wilderness for Syria; but that, as they were in fear of the Assyrians, who then had the dominion over Asia, they built a city in that country which is now called Judea, and that large enough to contain this great number of men, and called it Jerusalem."

After a digression, Josephus says that when this people, or shepherds, were gone out of Egypt to Jerusalem, *Tethmoses*, the king of Egypt, who drove them out, reigned afterward twenty-five years and four months, and then died, etc.

Knowing, as we do now, that it was *Aahmes* who drove them out and took the city of Avaris, we are in a condition to say that the supposed quotation from Manetho's history is, in fact, nothing but a confused summary of Manetho's account of the expulsion of the Hyksos, interspersed with passages taken from a later portion of his work referring, most probably, to the Exodus. The joint reign of Mephra and Tuthmosis has been changed to Mephragmuthosis, which has a close resemblance to Alisphragmuthosis; yet we are told that Thummosis, afterwards called Tethmosis, who drove them out, was the son of Alisphragmuthosis. It will not escape notice that the composition between Thummosis and the Hyksos, by which they left Egypt voluntarily with their families and their effects, does not apply to the Hyksos, but to the Exodus, the description of which was in this manner expunged from Manetho's work. Manetho had just described where the city of Avaris was situated, and how it was fortified by Saïtes, and we have just seen

that Apophis II, against whom this war was waged, resided in Avaris. Why, then, should Manetho, at this time, repeat that the shepherds were shut up in a place containing ten thousand acres which was named Avaris, and that they built a large and strong wall around it. The expression, "Tethmosis, the king of Egypt, who drove them out," shows that Manetho had just described how they had been *driven out* by Aahmes, who may have also been called Thothmes, which is another form of Aahmes. This forcible expulsion agrees with the actual facts, and demonstrates that the story of the peaceable withdrawal under a composition was taken from another part of the work, and interpellated here. If Josephus ever saw Manetho's work, and did not use an extract made by some one else, he must have written this portion from memory. The monuments inform us that the insurrection did not break out until the reign of *Seken-en-ra*, and that the Hyksos were expelled by Aahmes, who seems to have been his lineal descendant, although not his immediate successor. Now, substituting these names for those now in Manetho's account, we find that the kings of Thebes and other parts of Egypt make an insurrection against the Hyksos. We do not know who these other kings were. A long and terrible war results. Under a king, we will say the second *Seken-en-ra*, the Hyksos were subdued and driven out of the other parts of Egypt, and forced to seek refuge in the city of Avaris. *Seken-en-ra* falls upon the field of battle. He is succeeded by his son, *Aahmes*, who besieges and takes

**Avaris.** It is possible that the Hyksos evacuated this city and withdrew to Canaan, and that the taking mentioned on the monuments occurred after everybody who could leave was gone. The pursuit to Canaan, and the taking of Sheruhen in the sixth year of *Aahmes*, indicates as much.

#### RESTORED LIST OF HYKSOS DYNASTY

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| End of "Memphite kings," . . . . .                       | 2097 B. C.       |
| 1. Saïtes (Seth), . . . . .                              | 19               |
|  | <hr/> 2078 B. C. |
| 2. Paian, before epoch, . . . . .                        | 14               |
|  | <hr/> 2064 B. C. |
| Paian, after epoch, as " <i>Roch-les</i> ," . . . . .    | 30               |
|  | <hr/> 2034 B. C. |
| 3. Apophis I, . . . . .                                  | 61               |
|  | <hr/> 1973 B. C. |
| 4. <i>Sel-aan</i> (Sethos), before epoch, . . . . .      | 29               |
|  | <hr/> 1944 B. C. |
| <i>Sel-aan</i> , after epoch, as <i>Asas</i> , . . . . . | 20               |
|  | <hr/> 1924 B. C. |
| 5. Iannas, <i>Cha-ian</i> , or Chian, . . . . .          | 50               |
|  | <hr/> 1874 B. C. |
| 6. Apophis II (36 years, 7 months, and 2 months), .      | 37               |
| Hyksos Expulsion, . . . . .                              | <hr/> 1837 B. C. |

#### NEW EMPIRE

The expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt, which, as we have already demonstrated, occurred about 1837 B. C., paved the way for the New Empire. The Hyksos conquest, like the Norman conquest of England, consolidated the kingdom, by destroying the numerous local governments of Lower Egypt. The Middle Empire, which followed a period of division

and confusion lasting one hundred and forty-eight years, governed all Egypt with great splendor for two hundred and ten years. The Twelfth Dynasty, although of Theban extraction, ruled at Memphis, and was included among the "Memphite kings." In fact, there is no change in this respect until we reach the Hyksos Dynasty, and the contemporary local dynasty of Thebaid kings, at 2097 B. C., when Manetho's "other kings" began.

We have seen that the Thirteenth Dynasty held Memphis, although it no longer exercised sovereignty over the Delta, and that the Fifteenth Dynasty did not reside or make its capital at Thebes. But after Thebes had been the capital of the Sixteenth Dynasty for two hundred and sixty years, and had become celebrated and endeared to the native Egyptians as the great center of the "War of Liberation," the kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty, for this and other equally good reasons, decided to leave the capital where it then was, and thus Thebes, "The City" (*No*), "The Great City" (*No-ôa*) became the glorious capital of the New Empire.

It is true, as we have just seen, that the Hyksos were subdued, and driven out of other parts of Egypt, by a native king erroneously called Alisphragmuthosis, or Mephragmuthosis, by Josephus, and penned up in the fortress-city of Avaris, and further that they were besieged and driven out of this city by Aahmes, the son of the former king, called Thummosis and Tuthmosis by Josephus; but we are not informed as to how many years intervened between the expulsion

and the final establishment of the Eighteenth Dynasty and New Empire. We are told that "when these people (Hyksos) were gone out of Egypt to Jerusalem, Tethmosis (Amosis), *the king of Egypt, who drove them out*, reigned afterward twenty-five years and four months, and then died."

Manetho filled out the interval between the Expulsion, 1837 B. C., and the epoch of Pachons, 1824 B. C., with the reign of "Chebros," thirteen years. It follows, therefore, as all the numbers demonstrate, that Manetho's Eighteenth Dynasty, the only one we possess, *dates from the epoch of Pachons, 1824 B. C.* This important fact had been overlooked by the epitomist from whom Josephus copied, as we can now easily demonstrate. After the reign of Amosis, with twenty-five years and four months, Josephus continues his list as follows: "After him *his son* Chebros took the kingdom for thirteen years; after whom came Amenophthis for twenty years and seven months," etc. We know from contemporary monuments that Amosis was actually succeeded by *his son*; but this son's name was *Amen-hotep*, and not *Neb-roth*. Hence the name Chebros, which was placed *before* Amosis by Manetho, had been inserted immediately *after* Amosis by some epitomist before Josephus wrote his treatise against Apion. It is not difficult to discover how the mistake came to be made. Manetho, in his List of the Eighteenth Dynasty, expressly called Amosis "*the first*." An unknown epitomist found "Chebros," with a reign of thirteen years, between the Hyksos Dynasty and the Eighteenth Dynasty.

What disposition should he make of this extra reign? He could not add "Chebros" to the six kings of the Hyksos Dynasty, neither could he place him at the head of the Eighteenth Dynasty. In this dilemma he noticed that Amenophthis, the *son* of Amosis, had a reign of thirteen years and nine months, and, regarding this as an error, he substituted Chebros, with thirteen years, for Amenophthis with thirteen years and nine months. Before taking up the Eighteenth Dynasty, we will briefly recapitulate the main events leading down to the expulsion of the Hyksos and establishment of the New Empire:

1. The Sixteenth Dynasty developed its strength under the long and powerful reign of *Neb-cher-ra Menthu-hotep*, who was afterwards honored with *Se-ken-en-ra* and *Aahmes*.

2. *Se-ken-en-ra*, goaded by the tyranny of Apophis II, raised the standard of insurrection. A long and terrible war followed. The Hyksos were finally subdued and driven out of Egypt, but made a last stand behind the walls of Avaris.

3. Aahmes, the son of the conqueror, invested Avaris, and after a long and ineffectual siege the Hyksos evacuated the city and retired to Canaan, where they founded Jerusalem.

4. The "taking of Avaris," recorded in the tomb of the ship-captain Aahmes, son of Abana, at El-Kab, occurred after this evacuation.

5. If the remnant of the Hyksos invaders, numbering 240,000 fighting men, besides old men, women, and children, had been captured, this fact would

certainly have been mentioned in the ship-captain's account at El-Kab.

6. The ship-captain verifies the above in every particular, for he tells us that he was born in El-Kab, that his father was an officer under King *Se-ken-en-ra*, and that he performed the duties of an officer, in his father's place, on board the ship in the days of King *Neb-pehti-ra*.

7. *Neb-pehti-ra* pursued the Hyksos to Canaan, and besieged the town of Sharuhén in the sixth year of his reign, and finally "took it" (1832 B. C.)

8. The kings at this time were known by their throne-titles. In the inscription just referred to, *Taa-ôa-ken* and *Aahmes* are called *Se-ken-en-ra* and *Neb-pehti-ra*. Now, when we consider that *Aahmes*, "Child of the Moon," was the epoch-king of the Sothiac month of *Pa-chons*, "The Moon;" and, further, that *Chons* and the Hamite (Hyksos) *Nebroth*, or *Niprut*, both contain roots meaning to "hasten," "chase," "pursue," it is easy to understand how *Neb-pehra*, in the vernacular of the Delta, became *Nebroth*, *Nebros*, *Chnebro*s, and *Chebro*s, the "Pursuer" of the hostile Hyksos.

#### SOTHIAC LIST OF EIGHTEENTH DYNASTY

|                                 |       |       |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|
| Epoch of Pachons, . . . . .     | 1874  | B. C. |
| Amosis, . . . . .               | 25. 4 |       |
|                                 | <hr/> |       |
|                                 | 1799  | B. C. |
| Amenophthis, his son, . . . . . | 13. 9 |       |
|                                 | <hr/> |       |
|                                 | 1785  | B. C. |
| Amessis, his sister, . . . . .  | 20. 7 |       |
|                                 | <hr/> |       |
|                                 | 1765  | B. C. |

|  |            |                                      |            |       |
|--|------------|--------------------------------------|------------|-------|
| <i>Brought forward,</i> . . . . .                    | 1765       | B. C.                                |            |       |
| Mephrea, . . . . .                                   | 21. 9      |                                      |            |       |
|  | <hr/> 1743 | B. C.                                |            |       |
| Mephra and Tuthmosis, . . . . .                      | 12. 9      |                                      |            |       |
|  | <hr/> 1730 | B. C.                                |            |       |
| Tuthmosis III, . . . . .                             | 25.10      |                                      |            |       |
|  | <hr/> 1704 | B. C.                                |            |       |
| Epoch of Payni, . . . . .                            | 4. 1       |                                      |            |       |
| Amenophthis II, as "Armaios," . . . . .              | <hr/> 1700 | B. C.                                |            |       |
| Tuthmosis IV, . . . . .                              | 9. 8       |                                      |            |       |
|  | <hr/> 1691 | B. C.                                |            |       |
| Amenophthis III, . . . . .                           | 31.10      |                                      |            |       |
|  | <hr/> 1659 | B. C.                                |            |       |
| Horus, 36.9, . . .                                   | {          | Atenachenres, <i>brother</i> , . . . | 12. 1      |       |
|  |            |                                      | <hr/> 1647 | B. C. |
|  |            | Atenanches, <i>daughter</i> , . . .  | 12. 5      |       |
|  |            |                                      | <hr/> 1634 | B. C. |
|  |            | Acherres, <i>another</i> , . . . . . | 12. 3      |       |
|  |            |                                      | <hr/> 1622 | B. C. |
| Ramesses, . . . . .                                  |            |                                      | 1. 4       |       |
|  |            |                                      | <hr/> 1621 | B. C. |
| Sethos Menophthah, as " <i>Sa-payni</i> ," . . . . . |            |                                      | 36. 4      |       |
|  |            |                                      | <hr/> 1584 | B. C. |
| Sethos Menophthah, as " <i>Osiropis</i> ," . . . . . |            |                                      | 22.10      |       |
|  |            |                                      | <hr/> 1561 | B. C. |
| End of Dynasty, . . . . .                            |            |                                      |            |       |

Total duration of dynasty, according to Africanus, two hundred and sixty-three years, which fills out the interval between the epoch 1824 B. C. and 1561 B. C.

#### THE EIGHTEENTH DYNASTY OF SIXTEEN DIOS-POLITAN KINGS

The Eighteenth Dynasty of Manetho, as we have just seen, began at the epoch of Pachons, 1824 B. C., reigned two hundred and sixty-three years in round

numbers, and closed at the death of Sethos Menophthah, 1561 B. C. The present lists of this dynasty, and the Nineteenth Dynasty also, have been badly corrupted, in order to make them conform to certain erroneous dates for the Sojourn of the Children of Israel in Egypt. The oldest list we possess—to wit: that transmitted by Josephus in his celebrated treatise against Apion—contains several errors, which have found their way into all the other lists. It would take up too much space in this work to follow the successive discoveries, culminating finally in the restoration of Manetho's original list. We, therefore, reverse the natural and logical order, and start out with the restored list, so that the reader may have no difficulty in understanding the nature of the alterations intentionally, or unintentionally, introduced into the lists.

The list of Josephus is not dynastic. He merely enumerated the reigns between the Hyksos Expulsion and the supposed brothers, Egyptus and Danaus (Sethos or Sethosis, and Armais or Hermeus), in order to show that three hundred and ninety-three (?) years intervened between the Exodus and the flight of Danaus to Argos. There were, in fact, but two hundred and sixteen years between the Hyksos Expulsion and the beginning of *Seti's* reign.

The sixteen kings of Africanus include *Ach-en-aten* and his two daughters, Rathotis (?) and the epoch-title Armais.

We will now notice the reigns *seriatim*:

1. We have already shown that the twenty-five

years and four months of "Amosis" begin at the epoch 1824 B. C., and that he is the King "Tethmosis," who drove out the Hyksos. His wife also bore the name *Aahmes*, "Child of the Moon," coupled with *Nofert-ari*, usually rendered "Beautiful Consort of Aahmes." In the inscriptions this queen is styled, "divine wife of Amen," "great mistress of the two lands," "royal daughter," "royal sister," "royal wife," "royal mother," showing that she was entitled to the throne in her own right.

Aahmes, after taking Sharuhén in the southern part of Canaan, devoted the rest of his reign to suppressing insurrections and consolidating the kingdom.

2. The immediate successor of *Aahmes*, in Manetho's list, was his *son*. The monuments show conclusively that this *son* and successor was Amenophthis I. The name "Chebros," therefore, had been substituted for Amenophthis before Josephus copied the list. Aahmes reigned altogether, from his accession, thirty-nine years and one month, and it is probable that Amenophthis was well advanced in age when he ascended the throne. His reign of thirteen years and nine months (now thirteen years) agrees with this assumption. The campaigns of Thothmes I render it highly probable that Amenophthis I completed the conquest of Canaan, which his father had initiated by the taking of Sharuhén.

3. Manetho calls Amessis the *sister* of Amenophthis I. The monuments show that this king had a sister named *Aahmes*, to wit: the "royal sister Aahmes

*Nebt-ta* ("Mistress of the Land"), born of the great royal wife and royal mother *Aah-hotep*."

We know from the official list of Seti I (Table of Abydos), and other monuments also, that *Amen-hotep I* was succeeded by *Tahu-ti-mes I* (Thothmes, Tuthmosis). Now, do the monuments sustain Manetho, and show that this "royal sister," Amessis, who was styled "mistress of the land" during her brother's reign, became the wife of Thothmes I? We answer, unhesitatingly, "They do in the most conclusive manner." On the monuments of Thothmes I she is styled, "Divine wife, great mistress of the two countries, royal sister and royal wife, *Aahmes*." These titles show that she was the Queen of Egypt in her own right, and that Thothmes reigned, partly at least, by virtue of being her husband. I say, "partly at least," because there is reason to believe that there were two separate lines claiming hereditary rights to the throne, which were thus united.

Amessis reigned twenty years and seven months; but the insertion of Chebros in the place of Amenophthis necessarily forced all the succeeding names further down, so that Amenophthis now stands before the twenty years and seven months of Amessis, Amessis before the twenty-one years and nine months of Mephres, and so on, until we come to Tuthmosis III, who takes the place of Thothmes IV.

The reign of Thothmes I was one of the most brilliant in the annals of Egyptian history. Descended from the vigorous line represented by *Neb-cher-ra*, *Se-ken-en-ra*, and *Aahmes*, and allied by mar-

riage to the venerated heiress of the ancient Diospolitan line, he had the courage and audacity to carry the war into Asia, for the purpose of "slaking his anger" upon the hated '*Aamu*, and in the course of his long reign reduced and completely subdued Canaan and Syria to the banks of the Euphrates. Towards the close of his reign, Thothmes I associated his daughter *Het-shepsut* with him on the throne; but we have no means of knowing to which of the two, Amessis or Mephres, Manetho gave the joint-reign. In my opinion, however, the twenty years and seven months of Amessis extend down to the death of Thothmes I.

4. During the first ten years of her reign Mephres reigned jointly with her brother, Thothmes II. After his death, she assumed the throne-title *Ma-ka-ra*, which in that age became *Ma-ka-ph'ra*. Manetho, following the Lower Egyptian pronunciation, rendered it Mechephres, which was changed to Misa-phris, Mephres, Miphres, Memphres, and Mispres, all forms derived from the original Mechephres. Pliny, in his account of the obelisks, writes it Mesphres. But the reader may ask: "Why did Manetho use the *throne-title* of this queen, when he invariably uses the *sa-ra* names of the kings?" Although this exception to the rule may appear to be contradictory, it applies to queens only.

Nitocris and Sebkunophris are both throne-titles used by Manetho to designate queens in the Sixth and Twelfth Dynasties, where the *sa-ra* names of the kings are used. Upon reflection, it will be found that

there was a good reason for this. It is hard to see how a queen could be termed a "*son* of Ra," although, by the law of King Binothris, she was allowed to inherit the crown. Thus we find that Manetho was perfectly consistent in calling this queen "*Me-che-phres*," instead of *Het-shepsut*.

The twenty-one years and nine months of *Me-phres* extend down to the joint-reign of herself and son, *Thothmes III*. Much confusion has been caused by the fact that *Thothmes III*, after the death of his mother, dated his inscriptions from the death of *Thothmes II*, so that he appears to have reigned fifty-three years, eleven months, and one day, when, in fact, he only reigned, including his joint-reign with his mother, forty-two years and eight months. The Table of Abydos, omitting the queens, traces the succession through *Thothmes I*, *Thothmes II*, and *Thothmes III*. In such a list the reign of *Thothmes III* would date from his birth, and *Thothmes II* would have ten years and six months.

5. *Mephramuthosis* and *Misphragmuthosis* are corrupted forms of *Mephra* and *Tuthmosis*, the compound name by which Manetho designated the joint-reign of Queen *Ma-ka-ph'ra* and her infant son, *Thothmes III*. It is not probable that this imperious and ambitious queen resigned the reins of government before her death, when she must have been at least fifty-four years of age. Another view is suggested by the pseudo-Sothis List, where the joint-reign was fixed at sixteen years, and the sole-reign of *Thothmes III* apparently at twenty-three years,

and the total of both of these reigns at thirty-nine years; according to which it would seem that Mephres had survived about three years longer. It seems that the pseudo-Sothis List gave her alone eleven years, instead of twenty-one years and nine months.

6. The twenty-five years and ten months of the sole-reign of Thothmes III end at the epoch of Payni, 1704 B. C. This fact, hitherto unnoticed, shows that special attention was paid to the observation of the Sothiac epochs during this dynasty. A new epoch-title, *Cha-em-uas* (Chamois) was introduced by Thothmes III. "Crowned in Thebes" was equivalent to the ancient "re-crowned" and "re-born," and was used by four successive epoch-kings after Thothmes III. This new epoch-title is of great importance in solving one of the most difficult questions recently raised in this dynasty. It seems that Amenophthis II was associated with Thothmes III on the throne before this epoch, for he also assumed the title *Cha-em-uas* in the slightly modified form, *Se-cha-em-uas*, and also named one of his sons, born at this time, *Cha-em-uas*.

7. This reign dates from the epoch 1704 B. C., about two years after the Israelites settled in the land of Goshen, near Bubastis. All that has remained of it "Armais" with four years and one month, was transferred to the end of the dynasty to serve for Armais, the brother of Sethos, who was identified with Danaus. A moment's reflection will convince any one that Armais, who was never king but simply a deputy, could not have appeared in a dynastic list.

The epoch-title which was transferred was Harmachis, or "Horus on the horizon," the position of the sun in the Sothiac year at the beginning of Payni. The strangest thing in connection with this epoch-reign is, that it reaches exactly to the death of Thothmes III, who thus appears to have retired from active life about 1704 B. C. The following will illustrate this more plainly :

|   |    |       |    |        |
|---|----|-------|----|--------|
| Thothmes III, to joint-reign, . . . . . | 11 | years | 3  | months |
| Thothmes III, joint-reign, . . . . .    | 12 | "     | 9  | "      |
| Thothmes III, sole reign, . . . . .     | 25 | "     | 10 | "      |
| Thothmes III, epoch-reign, . . . . .    | 4  | "     | 1  | "      |
| Total, . . . . .                        | 53 | "     | 11 | "      |

One of the most recent errors made by modern Egyptologists is the error of assigning the twenty-five years and ten months of the sole-reign of Thothmes III, before the epoch 1704 B. C., to Amenophthis II. Petrie, after conceding that no monuments of Amenophthis II bear a higher date than the fifth year of his reign, and admitting that the monuments of his reign are comparatively numerous, contends that "lately the *absolute proof* of the length of this reign has been found on a wine-jar dated in the twenty-sixth year of Amenhotep II, *thus agreeing with Manetho*." This supposed date on the wine-jar is a palpable mistake, brought about by the desire to find something to support a self-evident misconstruction of Manetho's List; for it is plain that if Amenhotep II had reigned during these additional twenty-one years some proof of it would have survived in a period

where monuments were so numerous. For fear the reader might consider this assertion more positive than the facts warrant, I will say that the Sothiac division of the reign of Seti I, which is astronomically absolute, demonstrates that a reign of twenty-five or twenty-six years for Amenhotep II is a mathematical impossibility. I plant myself upon the conceded fact that no monument of Amenhotep II has ever been found, the date of which is beyond his fifth year, the supposed date on the alleged wine-jar to the contrary notwithstanding.

8. The reign of Thothmes IV, who was the son of Amenhotep II, is fixed at nine years and eight months. After Armais had been substituted for Amenhotep II, and then transferred to the end of the dynasty to serve as the fictitious king "Danaus," Tuthmosis stood alike for Thothmes III and Thothmes IV.

During his long and eventful reign Thothmes III systematically subjugated Canaan and Syria, making yearly expeditions into those countries from the twenty-second to the forty-second years of his reign. They were thoroughly subjected, and organized into Egyptian provinces. A custom sprang up about this time which was destined to have an injurious effect upon the Egyptian Government and State. The kings of Egypt gave their daughters in marriage to the kings of Mesopotamia, and in return took wives from among the daughters of these foreign kings. As a natural result of this, the Egyptian court gradually adopted Asiatic customs and ceremonials. The wife

of Thothmes IV was of foreign birth, and, although her mother may have been an Egyptian princess married to one of these Asiatic kings, foreign blood found its way through her into the ancient solar line of native rulers.

9. Amenophthis III was of mixed race, as his physiognomy clearly discloses. He was young when he mounted the throne, which accounts for his long reign of thirty-five or thirty-six years. Manetho, however, gave him only thirty-one years and ten months (now, by mistake, thirty years and ten months), owing to his joint-reign with Amenhotep IV, or *Aten-ach-en-ra*, his eldest son by Taia, the Mitannian princess.

Amenophthis III married Taia in his tenth year, consequently Amenophthis IV must have been about twenty-one years old when he was associated with his father on the throne. Taia was the sister of Dush-ratta, King of Mitanni, or Naharina, the country in which Haran, of Mesopotamia, was situated. This queen, owing to her beauty, intellect, and strong personality, coupled with the mixed blood of Amenophthis III, succeeded in acquiring a powerful influence over her husband and the court generally—an influence which dominated all Egypt under the reign of her son, Amenhotep IV. Under the time-honored rules of descent, the son of a foreign princess was not eligible to the throne. Although the powerful kings of this dynasty, backed up by victorious armies, were able to pass the crown to the princes born of foreign mothers, the unlawful practice ul-

timately led to revolution and the reinstatement of the lawful line.

10. Horus, or *Har-em-heb*, is the immediate successor of Amenophthis III in the Official List of Seti I at Abydos. In such a chronological list he necessarily received thirty-six years and nine months (now thirty-six years and five months), although he did not begin to reign until twenty-four years and six months after the death of his father, Amenophthis III. The actual succession upon the throne was as follows: Amenophthis IV and *Aten-anch-es*, the daughter of Amenophthis IV, reigned successively for twenty-four years and six months before *Har-em-heb* mounted the throne. Manetho mentioned the legitimate, or official, line and the *actual* line, and the trouble and confusion since experienced arose from the error of *copying both* into the lists as consecutive.

As we have seen, Amenophthis IV reigned jointly with his father for four or five years. Add this to the reign of twelve years and one month assigned to him by Manetho, and we have a total reign of about sixteen years. Now, wine-jars found at Tel-el Amarna, the site of his capital, are dated up to his seventeenth year. But Amenophthis IV associated his daughter *Aten-anch-es* upon the throne during the last four or five years of his reign, and the twelve years and one month of Manetho extend from *Aten-acherres'* accession as joint-king to the accession of his daughter *Atenanches* as joint-queen. Eusebius, therefore, gives this king sixteen years, and his

daughter eight years; together, twenty-four years. Amenophthis IV, at the time of his accession as joint-king, was united in marriage to *Tadu-chepa*, the daughter of Dushratta, and niece of his mother, Taia. Her name was changed to *Nofer-taiti*. Manetho mentioned her reign, calling her Rathotis, which thus found its way into two of the lists. In Josephus it appears as Rathotis with nine years; in Africanus, as Rathos with six years. It is entirely wanting in the other lists. It seems that Manetho also gave the length of the reigns of *Taiti* and *Atenanches*.

When *Har-em-hcb*, in his old age, was crowned in the temple of Amen at Thebes, he was solemnly united in marriage to an unnamed princess who was the heiress to the crown. The last of the three collateral reigns, "*Atencheres, another*," with twelve years and three months, represents the true reign of Horus, or, more properly, his *wife*. The veneration of *Aten*, or the "sun's disk," as it is called by Egyptologists, the "splendor of Ra" (*ach-en-ra*), was connected with Pharaoh's position in the Sothiac year just below the western horizon. The monuments do not leave us in doubt on this point, for they tell us expressly that *Har-em-achu* (Harmachis), "Horus on the Horizon," is equivalent to *Aten ach-en-ra*, "Aten, the Splendor of Ra." The opposition to this king and his daughters was chiefly owing to his foreign mother, foreign blood, foreign wife, and foreign court.

Under Amenophthis III we find, as governors of Nubia, two officials named *Hui* and *Amenhotep*, bearing the titles, *Suten-sa en Kush* and *Emir satu*

found that a "King's son of Aisi" and "Governor of the foreign lands of the South." We find these same officials under *Tas-dut-dwaa* the husband of *Au-ut-ta-dwaa* whose name was changed to *Au-ut-dwaa* the bearing the additional title of "the heart in the right of the king," showing that no great period of time had elapsed between the death of Amenophis III and the accession of *Au-ut-dwaa*.

11. *Ramesses I* is not, as many have supposed, the head of a new dynasty. Manetho, who had better sources of information than we now have, entered him in this dynasty, and we may safely assume that he belonged to the same family. The monuments show that *Ramesses I* in the second year of his reign associated his son *Seti I*, with himself upon the throne. *Seti* was not over ten or twelve years of age at the time, and the joint-reign of father and son continued for many years. Manetho gave *Ramesses I* the one year and four months of his sole-reign, and *Sethos* (*Seti I*) the entire fifty-nine years and two months from his accession as joint-king to his death. This fact has led Egyptologists into the error of assuming that *Ramesses I* reigned but one year and four months, when, in fact, he seems to have reigned until *Seti* was well advanced in years.

12. The reign of *Sethos*, by some unaccountable mishap, disappeared from the lists. The *hiatus* also appears in the List of Josephus. Was the omission due to him, or to others before him? In the work

of Manetho there was the following chronological succession in the official line.

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Ramesses I, . . . . .                   | 1.4  |
| Sethos Menophthah, . . . . .            | 59.2 |
| Ramesses Miamun, . . . . .              | 66.2 |
| Menophthah, . . . . .                   | 19.6 |
| Sethos (Necht-sethos), . . . . .        | 51   |
| Rampses-hakes (Ramesses III), . . . . . | 61   |

Josephus overlooked Seti I when he copied the reigns down to Menophthah. These reigns actually cover a period of three hundred and forty-eight years, but he made the total three hundred and thirty-three years, by omitting Seti's reign of fifty-nine years and including the extra thirty-six years and five months of Horus, as well as the thirty-six years and nine months of Amenophthis IV and his daughters, and the nine years of Rathotis.

The reference to the naval force and naval battle of Ramesses III shows plainly how he confused and blended Seti I and Ramesses II, on the one hand, and *Set-necht* and Ramesses III on the other. By placing Sethos and Ramesses *after* Menophthah, instead of *before* him, he gained one hundred and eighty-nine years for the length of the period between the Hyksos Expulsion and the Flight of Danaus. There can be no possible doubt that the Sethos who was called Ægyptus, and made the celebrated expedition into Canaan, Mesopotamia, and the "eastern parts" beyond Assyria, was Seti I. Hence, it is high time to give up all theories founded on such palpable mistakes. Thus Amenophis (that is, Men-

ophthah), Manetho's Pharaoh of the Exodus, did not follow after Ramesses III, or five hundred and eighteen years after the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty, as Josephus computes it, but he followed immediately after Ramesses II, three hundred and twenty-nine years after the epoch 1824 B. C. In the same way, Sethos, or Egyptus, commenced to reign, as a boy, two hundred and sixteen years only after the expulsion of the Hyksos. We are deeply indebted to Josephus, however, for the positive assurance that, according to Manetho's express statement, Sethos Egyptus reigned fifty-nine years, as did his eldest son Ramesses *after* him sixty-six years, which is true and authentic.

The great epoch of Epiphi 1584 B. C., as we have demonstrated in another chapter, divided Seti's reign into unequal parts of thirty-six and twenty-three years respectively. As the first part of his reign was in the month of Payni, he was *Sá-payni*, now "Spanios," for thirty-six years, and, as the second part thereof was in the month of Epiphi, he was Osiropis, or *Husiri-api* (whence Egyptus), for twenty-three years. But as this long and brilliant reign can now be restored to the lists, it will be reserved for a separate chapter, devoted to the great Sesostris of Greek legend.

## SETI, SETHOS, SETHOSIS, OR SESOSTRIS

The discovery that Seti I, who was called Sethos by Manetho, reigned fifty-nine years, instead of nine or nineteen years, as heretofore assumed, and that

he was the celebrated epoch-king of Epiphi, 1584 B. C., familiarly known as "Osiropis," places him and his reign in a new and unexpected light. Although these fifty-nine years undoubtedly include his long coregency with his father, Ramesses I, his sole reign alone must have covered an average generation; for, as we have just seen, his epoch-reign as "Osiropis" amounted to twenty-three years. As a genial and fearless leader of men upon the field of battle, as a conqueror who overthrew the armies of the most powerful nations of his time, and carried the Egyptian standards into regions where they had never been seen before, and as a builder of grand and singularly beautiful monuments, he was unrivaled in Egyptian history, and his renown was so great and enduring that, in the popular mind of after ages, he became a legendary hero, like Nimrod, the great Sesotris of the Greek classics. It is true that popular fancy ascribed to this legendary Sesotris various noted actions performed by Usertasen III, Thothmes I, Ramesses II, and others, and it was, no doubt, on this account, as well as others, that Manetho found fault with Herodotus "for his ignorance and false relations of Egyptian affairs." Fortunately, a brief summary of Manetho's account of this king's reign has come down to us. After setting down the names and reigns of the kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty, ending with Menophthah, but altogether omitting Seti, Josephus says: "After him came Sethosis, and Ramesses, who had an army of horse and a naval force. This king appointed his

brother Armais to be his deputy over Egypt.” According to this extract, it was Ramesses, and not Sethosis, who had the army of horse and the naval force, and appointed his brother to be his deputy over Egypt.

It did not escape the notice of Josephus that this did not harmonize with the extract concerning Sethosis which he was about to incorporate in his treatise, and he, therefore, offered the following explanation: “In another copy it stood thus: ‘After him came Sethosis and Ramesses, two brethren, the former of whom had a naval force, and in a hostile manner destroyed those who met him on the sea; but as he slew Ramesses in no long time afterward, so he appointed another of his brethren to be his deputy over Egypt.’” We now know that it was Ramesses III, the son of the second Sethos of Manetho’s Lists, who “had a naval force” and “destroyed those who met him upon the sea,” and it is perfectly evident that the copies consulted by Josephus were merely variant excerpts from Manetho’s history, in which Sethos I and Ramesses II were already confounded and blended with Sethos II and Ramesses III.

We have already seen how Sethos I was crowded out of the lists in consequence of the insertion in the official chronological list of the Eighteenth Dynasty of the epoch-reigns of Chebros and Armais and the collateral reigns of *Ach-en-aten* and his two daughters.

The defeat of the Mediterranean nations by

Ramesses III was certainly mentioned in Manetho's work, for this king had caused beautiful representations of his great naval victory to be sculptured on the walls of the temple erected by him at Medinet Habu, and it is also mentioned in the Harris papyrus. After Sethos I had disappeared from the lists, it was natural to suppose that all these accounts belonged to one and the same king. But we are now in a position to distinguish the acts and deeds of Sethos from those of Ramesses III. It was Sethos who appointed his brother Harmais deputy over Egypt during his absence in foreign countries, because *he alone* was called "Egyptus," that is, "*Hus-ar Api.*" Josephus tells us that Sethosis gave his brother all the other authority of a king, with these exceptions only, that he should not wear the diadem, nor be injurious to the queen, etc., adding, *verbatim*:

"While he (Sethosis) made an expedition against Cyprus and Phœnicia, and besides, against the Assyrians and the Medes, . . . he then subdued them all, some by his arms, some without fighting, and some by the terror of his great army; and, being puffed up by the great successes he had had, he went on still more boldly, and overthrew the cities and countries that lay in the eastern parts; but after considerable time, Armais, who was left in Egypt, did all those very things, by way of opposition, which his brother had forbidden him to do, without fear, for . . . at the persuasion of his friends he put on the diadem, and set up to oppose his brother; but then, he who was set over the priests of Egypt, wrote letters to Sethosis, and informed him of all that had happened, and how

his brother had set up to oppose him; he therefore returned back to Pelusium immediately, and recovered his kingdom again. The country also was called, from his name, Egypt; for Manetho says that Sethosis himself was called Egyptus, as was his brother Armais called Danaus."

This much undoubtedly related to Seti I, for incidents taken from this campaign were, by order of this king, engraved on the outer wall of the Great Hall at Karnak, where they can still be seen. There can be no doubt that this account was originally copied from Manetho's work, and that he here describes the expedition which gave rise to the legends of Sethosis.

When Josephus hurriedly made these extracts, he was trying to prove the antiquity of the Jews, and Sethos II and Ramesses III naturally suited his purpose better than Seti I, for he continues as follows:

"This is Manetho's account, and evident it is, from the number of years by him set down belonging to this interval, if they be summed up together, that these shepherds, as they are here called, who were no other than our forefathers, were delivered out of Egypt, and came thence, and inhabited this country three hundred and ninety-three years before Danaus came to Argos, although the Argives look upon him as their most ancient king."

In another place, speaking of the Exodus, which he confounds with the expulsion of the Hyksos, Josephus says:

"Now from his days (meaning Amosis) the reigns of the intermediate kings, according to Manetho.

amounted to three hundred and ninety-three years, as he says himself, till the two brothers, Sethos and Hermeus; the one of whom, Sethos, was called by that other name of Egyptus, and the other, Hermeus, by that of Danaus. He also says that Sethos cast the other out of Egypt, and reigned fifty-nine years, as did his eldest son Rhampses reign after him sixty-six years."

It is hardly necessary to repeat that this number of three hundred and ninety-three years was not derived from Manetho, because he placed Seti I two hundred and seventeen years only after the expulsion of the Hyksos. It is the sum as computed by Josephus himself, and is made up of the three hundred and thirty-three years of his list (including the reigns of Ramesses II and Menophthah) and the fifty-nine years of Sethos.

The true interval from the expulsion of the Hyksos to the end of Menophthath's reign is three hundred and sixty-one years; but, to the beginning of Sethos' reign, only two hundred and seventeen years. The same error enters into the total of five hundred and eighteen years from the expulsion of the Hyksos to Manetho's Pharaoh of the Exodus, which Josephus obtained by adding the fifty-nine years of Sethos and the sixty-six years of Ramesses to his false total of three hundred and ninety-three years. The true sum was three hundred and forty-two years. It is significant that in the first copy Josephus found these names written Sethosis and Armais, while in the other they were written Sethos and Hermeus. This indicates that he used different extracts, made by

different authors, and that much of the confusion apparent in his alleged extracts was owing to this fact. As epoch-king of Epiphi, 1584 B. C., Sethos assumed several epoch-titles, such as Osiropis, Chamois, *Nem-mestu*, and *Nem-chau*. Osiropis is the Greek form of *Hus-ir-api*, that is, Osiris in his character of Apis-bull, or Nile. The statement, therefore, that "the country also was called, from his name, Egypt," is the conclusion of Josephus or the author from whom he copied, for he adds: "For Manetho says that Sethosis himself was called Egyptus." This was true, in one sense, for *Seti* was also called *Hus-ir-Api*, the second element of which (*Hapi* or *Api*) was sometimes used to designate the Nile; and in early times the Nile was called Egyptus by the Greeks. We shall see that Æschylos, fully two hundred years before Manetho, knew Seti I by the name of Egyptus, and his perfidious brother by the name of Danaus, which proves, to a certainty, that Manetho did not render Osiropis "Egyptus," but that he merely adopted the rendition in use among the Greeks in his time.

*Cha-em-uas*, "Crowned in Thebes," is an epoch-title introduced by Thothmes III, and borne by five successive epoch-kings.

*Nem-mestu*, "Re-born," and *Nem-chau*, "Re-crowned," are epoch-titles assumed by Amenemes I to mark the beginning of a new Sothiac cycle, because Ra was then re-born and re-crowned as "Horus, the babe" (*Har-pa-chrat*), wherefore their use by Seti, who merely ushered in a new Sothiac month, appears to be an unwarranted innovation upon the an-

cient custom. In the same way, *sed*-festivals, which were originally celebrated at the middle or beginning of the last quarter of a Sothiac month, seem to have been celebrated by Ramesses II regardless of these important astronomical periods. We have just seen that, according to Manetho, supported by the contemporary monuments at Thebes, Sethos invaded, *first*, Phoenicia and Cyprus, *then* the Assyrians and Medes, and, *lastly*, being puffed up by his successes, the "eastern parts."

This, I have no doubt, is strictly historical, and constitutes the "grain of fact" out of which the legends associated with the name of Sesostris sprouted and grew. Diodorus relates, on the authority of the Egyptian priests, that Sesostris excelled all his ancestors in great and famous actions; that, *after his birth*, his father, having performed a noble act, became king, and caused all the boys of Egypt, who were born on the same day with Sesostris, to be brought up and educated with him, all of them being required to go through the same exercises and to submit to the same discipline, in which way they were fitted, by bodily vigor and intellectual attainments, to undertake great actions, and, if necessary, become commanders.

Sesostris and his companions were first sent with an army to Arabia, which country they subdued, but not until they had accustomed themselves, by hunting wild beasts, to endure the fatigues and the want of water and provisions incident to desert life.

Afterwards he was sent to the western parts, and

conquered the greater part of Libya, being as yet but a youth. Coming to the crown, after his father's death, Sesostriis, emboldened by his successes, conceived the design of conquering the whole world. With this view, he proceeded to gain the good will of all the Egyptians, influencing many by his affable and courteous demeanor, others by money, and others still by gifts of land. He also pardoned those who were condemned for high treason, and liberated a vast number who, strange to say, were imprisoned for debt. He divided Egypt into thirty-six nomes (?), over every one of which he appointed a governor. Out of these nomes he chose the strongest and ablest men, and thus raised an army of six hundred thousand foot, twenty-four thousand horse, and twenty-seven hundred chariots, which were officered by the young men who had been brought up with him and were used to martial exercises from their childhood. The number of these is said to have been seventeen hundred. Thus they were attached to their king, and to one another, by bonds of brotherly affection.

Upon these companions Sesostriis bestowed large estates and lands in the richest parts of Egypt, reserving only their attendance upon his person in times of war (Feudal tenures, which were so common among the Franks, Saxons, Normans, and other German nations). Having organized the army, he first subdued the Ethiopians, and forced them to pay him a tribute of ebony, gold, and elephants' tusks. He then sailed into the Red Sea with a fleet of four hundred vessels, being the first Egyptian to build long

---

ships, and gained the islands of this sea, and subdued the bordering nations as far as India. He likewise marched his army through Asia, subdued the Skythians to the river Tanais, where, it was said, he left some of the Egyptians who were afterwards known as the Colchians, and penetrated into Thrace, where he came near losing his army, owing to the difficulty of the passages and want of provisions.

Having spent nine years in this expedition, he returned to Egypt loaded with spoils, and bringing large numbers of captives with him.

After his return, he devoted himself to the arts of peace, adorned the temples with rich presents and the spoils of his enemies, erected many fair and stately works, built temples in the principal cities, intersected Egypt with a network of canals, and defended the eastern frontier by a wall drawn from Pelusium, through the deserts, to Heliopolis, employing his captives in these gigantic works.

He also caused a ship, or *ark*, to be made of cedar, two hundred and eighty cubits in length, gilded over on the outside and lined with silver within, which he dedicated to Amen, the god most adored by the Thebans.

He erected two obelisks of polished marble, one hundred and twenty cubits high, on which were inscribed a description of the large extent of his empire, the value of his revenues, and the number of the nations conquered by him; and he placed in the temple of Phthah, at Memphis, statues of himself and wife, each of one entire stone, thirty cubits in height, and of his sons, twenty cubits in height.

Diodorus concludes his account of Sesostris by adding that he seems to have excelled all other kings of Egypt that were eminent for power and greatness, in warlike achievements, the number of his gifts and oblations, and his wonderful works in Egypt. His fame and renown continued down to the time of Darius, and he was venerated by the people next to Osiris. After he had reigned thirty-three (23?) years, he became blind, and put an end to his own life. He was admired for this, not only by the priests, but by all the rest of the Egyptians; for his voluntary death, after his sphere of usefulness had been abruptly cut off, was in keeping with his glorious life.

We have given this summary of the account of Diodorus in order to contrast it with the account of Manetho and the facts revealed by the monuments.

Going back to the truthful and sober account of Manetho, we find that Seti, before the expulsion of his brother Armais, made an expedition against Cyprus and Phœnicia, and also against the Assyrians and the Medes, and that, after he had subdued these, he went on still more boldly, and overthrew the cities and countries that lay in the "eastern parts."

This account is verified by the representations and explanatory inscriptions of the campaigns of Seti I engraved on the north wall of the Great Hall at Karnak. Here, according to Ebers, in Baedeker, we can see Seti storming the fortress of Kanana in the land of Edom, in South Palestine. Here are pictured representations of his battles with the *Fenechu* (Phœnicians), the *Charu* (Canaanites), the

*Ermennu* and *Eltennu*, or "Iltannu," (Mesopotamians, Syrians, or Assyrians), and the storming of *Kadesh*, the stronghold of the Hittites, and *Ninua*, a city of the Assyrians *situated on a river*.

We have seen that Manetho used the expression, "cities and countries that lay in the eastern parts," with reference to countries lying east of the Assyrians and Medes; and we must bear in mind that he wrote about 287 B. C., and used the geographical names in vogue at that time. The Asiatic campaigns of the Egyptian kings were necessarily alike in many particulars. The starting point was invariably Pelusium, or the "Pelusian Daphne," and the line of march the great military and commercial highway along the shores of the Mediterranean already described in our comments on the "Pyramid Texts." Under such circumstances, it is not at all strange that, in the course of centuries, various details of successive campaigns were confounded and credited to one and the same popular hero. Thus Sethos and his son Ramesses, who was called "Se-sethos" (Son of Sethos), owing to their joint-reign, joint enterprises, and joint works, were afterwards regarded as one. Again, Manetho certainly mentioned Sesostris in connection with Usertasen II or III of the Twelfth Dynasty, and this fact, no doubt, induced the manipulators of Manetho's Lists, who were engaged in the hopeless task of fixing "Menes, the first king," their "Mestrain," or Mizraim, at 2726 B. C., to identify Seti with Usertasen, and drop him from the List of the Eighteenth Dynasty, where he stood last.

In the List of Africanus we find the remark that Sesostris (who occupies the place of Usertasen II, who reigned seventeen years, and Usertasen III, who reigned thirty-eight years) subjected Ethiopia and all Asia to Thrace, and was venerated by the Egyptians next to Osiris. In the later List of Eusebius, however, there is *prefixed* to this remark the additional remark, taken from Sesochris of the Second Dynasty, that he was four cubits, three palms, and two fingers in height. This shows how the manipulators of the list tried to blend, and reduce to one, Sesochris, User-tosis, Sethosis, Sesethosis, and Sesonchis. We will now briefly examine the chief incidents of the account transmitted by Diodorus:

1. Sesostris excelled all his ancestors in great and famous actions. . . .

This needs no comment, as it is merely a matter of opinion.

2. His father, having performed a noble action, became king, *after* the birth of Sesostris. . . .

Ramesses I was the successor of Horus (*Har-em-heb*), who reigned in the right of his wife, and may have become king in the manner stated. It was certainly after Seti's birth, for he was made co-regent after his father had reigned but one year and four months, when he must have been, according to custom, twelve years old. This indicates that Ramesses I also obtained the throne through the hereditary right of his wife, the *mother* of Seti.

3. Sesostris was brought up and educated with the boys of Egypt who were born on the same day with him. . . .

There is nothing improbable in this, although it might, with equal probability, apply to Usertasen.

4. Sesostris and his companion were sent to Arabia, and subdued that country. Afterwards he was sent to Libya, and conquered the greater part of that country, being still a youth, that is, I suppose, wearing the sidelock of minority. As this was before his father's death, Seti may not have been permitted to record these juvenile exploits upon the walls of the Temple of Amen at Thebes.

4. After his father's death, Sesostris conceived the plan of conquering the whole world, proceeded to win the good will of the Egyptians, pardoned those who were condemned for high treason, and liberated a vast number who were imprisoned for debt.

All this may have applied to Usertasen I or Sethos, for many cases of high treason occurred under Amenemes I and Ramesses I, both of whom re-established the old order of things after periods of anarchy.

5. He first subdued the Ethiopians, and forced them to pay tribute.

This seems to apply to Usertasen, for Seti's campaign against the Edomites of Canaan took place in the first year of his sole-reign.

6. We have already commented on the expedition through Asia.

A monument preserved in the Louvre (C. I.) shows that Usertasen I overthrew the *Hir-u-sha*, the *Mentiu*, and the Hittites. I refer to the monument of *Menthu-nesu*, translated by Brugsch. Eratosthenes, according to Strabo, wrote of a memorial tablet set

up by Sesostris at the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb, commemorating in hieroglyphs his passage of the Red Sea, after he had, in the beginning of his reign, first subjected the Ethiopians and Troglodytes. He passed over to Arabia, and thence through Asia. Now, this does not agree with the account of the Asiatic campaign of Sethos, as described by himself on the walls of the Temple of Karnak, and by Manetho. It must be said, however, that there is a representation of a campaign against the Libyans.

7. After his return, Sesostris adorned the temples with rich presents, erected many fair and stately works, built temples in the principal cities, intersected Egypt with a network of canals, defended the eastern frontier by a wall drawn from Pelusium to Heliopolis, caused an ark to be made, and erected two obelisks, etc.

All this seems to apply to Sethos and Sesethos. The monuments, temples, etc., even in their present ruined condition, speak for themselves. The representations just referred to show the long-bearded inhabitants of the Libanus felling the tall and slender cedars for the ark, which he dedicated to Amen.

8. He placed in the Temple of Ptah, at Memphis, colossal statues of himself and wife, each of one stone, thirty cubits in height, etc,

These statues survive, although the magnificent Temple of *Ptah*, which rivaled that of *Amen* at Thebes, has entirely disappeared. They were placed there by Sesothis or Ramesses II, and are, in fact, *colossal*.

9. After he had reigned thirty-three years, he became blind, and committed suicide.

If Sethos actually reigned thirty-three years as sole king, his joint-reign must have covered twenty-six years. A reign of twenty-seven years and four months for Ramesses I accords well with all the historical probabilities. This would make Sethos thirty-eight years old at his father's death, and seventy-one years old at his own death, and account for his early campaigns in Arabia and Libya.

10. The reference to Osiris points unmistakably to Seti, who was known and venerated as Osiropis, or Serapis.

The fable of the six sons, two of whom were used as a "*bridge*," and four of whom were saved, related by the "Father of History," probably grew out of an allegory. It was the *fashion*, at that time, to veil scientific facts under allegories. The reign of Seti "*bridged*" *two* of the Sothiac months of the second half of the cycle which commenced in the year 2784 B. C. (compare *han-ti*).

After he had reigned twenty-six years as co-regent, and nine or ten years as sole king, to wit, in the year 1584 B. C., the Sothiac month of Pa-oni came to an end, that is, *died*, and the Sothiac month of Epiphi commenced, that is, was *born*. Seti, as *Sa-payni*, or "Spanios" ("Son of Payni"), *died*, and was "re-born" and "re-crowned" (*nem-mestu* and *nem-chau*) as *Hus-ar-Api*, or "Osiropis." The ceiling of the long and narrow chamber of the beautiful Temple of Abydos, which contains the world-renowned

“Table of Abydus,” is ornamented with the cartouches of Seti, bearing the legends “*nem-mestu*” and “*nem-chau*,” in fact, this temple was erected to commemorate this important chronological event. Seti and his infant son, Ramesses, are represented as standing before and doing homage to the long, double line of seventy-six “ancestors,” who wore the double crown of the South and North; that is, claimed to exercise universal dominion. Ramesses is pictured as a boy wearing the sidelock; consequently he was born before this date (1584 B. C.), and, as he is pictured as a boy at his father’s side in the representation of the Libyan campaign, which we can fix somewhere near the ninth year of Seti’s sole-reign, he must have been fully ninety years old at the time of his death, possibly one hundred. The regnal years of Seti date from his accession as sole king, and the end of his ninth year carries us down, approximately, to the epoch of Epiphi, 1584 B. C., when a new count was commenced.

NINETEENTH DYNASTY OF SEVEN DIOSPOLITAN KINGS

The List of Africanus, originally the most reliable, although now badly corrupted, is as follows:

| NINETEENTH DYNASTY OF SEVEN DIOSPOLITAN KINGS |     |       |
|---|-----|-------|
| 1. Sethos, . . . . .                          | 51  | years |
| 2. Rapsakes, . . . . .                        | 61  | “     |
| 3. Amenophthis, . . . . .                     | 20  | “     |
| 4. Ramesses, . . . . .                        | 60  | “     |
| 5. Ammenemnes, . . . . .                      | 5   | “     |
| 6. Thuoris, . . . . .                         | 7   | “     |
|   |     | <hr/> |
| Total, . . . . .                              | 209 | “     |

The List of Eusebius, which reduces the number of kings to five, including Thuoris, is as follows:

**NINETEENTH DYNASTY OF FIVE DIOSPOLITAN KINGS**

|                           |          |          |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|
| 1. Sethos, . . . . .      | 55 years | 55 years |
| 2. Rampses, . . . . .     | 66 "     | 66 "     |
| 3. Amenephthis, . . . . . | 40 "     | 8 "      |
| 4. Ammenemes, . . . . .   | 26 "     | 26 "     |
| 5. Thuoria, . . . . .     | 7 "      | 7 "      |
| Total, . . . . .          | 194 "    | 194 "    |

Now we have seen that the Eighteenth Dynasty came to a close at the death of Sethos I, 1561 B. C., a date established by the total of two hundred and sixty-three years from the epoch 1824 B. C., checked by the epoch-reign of "Harmais," 1704 B. C., and astronomically fixed by the epoch-reign of "Osiropis." As Sethos reigned twenty-three years after 1584 B. C., or to 1561 B. C., the end of the Eighteenth Dynasty, it follows, axiomatically, that Ramesses II Miamun, and not Sethos, headed Manetho's Nineteenth Dynasty. But how can we account for Sethos appearing as the first king of the dynasty in the present lists?

Now, bear in mind that Josephus confounded the Expulsion of the Hyksos with the Exodus of the Israelites, and that he placed this event at about 1648 B. C. In copying the Manethonian Lists, his avowed object was to show how many years intervened between the Exodus and the "Flight of Danaus," "the most ancient king of the Argives;" he was not copying Manetho's dynasties, but simply extracting a consecutive list of the reigns between these two events.

Now, it so happened that he made several stupendous mistakes in the list thus extracted. In the first place, Egyptus, the brother of Danaus, was certainly Sethos I, who commenced to reign about two hundred and seventeen years after the Hyksos Expulsion, but Josephus omitted his reign of fifty-nine years between Ramesses I and Ramesses II, which enabled him to bring in the eighty-five years and eight months of Ramesses II and Menophthah before "Sethosis, who was also Ramesses." He also added four side-reigns with forty-five years and nine months to his list (which contained the thirty-six years and nine months of Horus), whereby he obtained three hundred and thirty-three instead of two hundred and sixteen years, down to Sethosis. Not satisfied with this result, he went further, and added sixty additional years for the fifty-nine years and two months of Sethos, which gave him three hundred and ninety-three years from the Exodus to the "Flight of Danaus." It is clear that "Sethosis, who was also Ramesses," introduced by Josephus at the end of his list, was *Set-necht*, who reigned jointly with his son Ramesses III; for we know, from the monuments, that the "naval force" mentioned by Josephus belonged to him, and that he won a great naval victory over the foreign nations that invaded Egypt during his reign. Notwithstanding this, when Josephus came to fix the date of Menophthah, Manetho's Pharaoh of the Exodus, he went back to Sethos I, stating that, according to Manetho, he reigned fifty-nine years, and that his eldest son Ramesses reigned

after him sixty-six years, and, by adding these additional one hundred and twenty-five years to his former total of three hundred and ninety-three years, obtained a total of five hundred and eighteen years from the Hyksos Expulsion to the reign of Menophthah, when, in fact, it was only about three hundred and forty-two years.

It is remarkable that so many errors could have found their way into such a small list, and that the early Christian chronographers should have regarded it as more reliable than the work of Manetho itself, from which it purports to have been extracted.

The Lists of Eusebius show that by his time Ramesses II and Menophthah had been added to the Eighteenth Dynasty, upon the supposed authority of Josephus, and the Nineteenth Dynasty correspondingly reduced to five kings, with Sethos II, or *Set-necht*, at its head.

The first and second kings in the List of Africanus are undoubtedly *Seti II*, or *Set-necht*, and Ramesses III, but some one, in order to keep up the total, inserted Ramesses with sixty instead of sixty-one, years, a second time, as number four, where Rampsakes, or Ramesses III, originally stood.

As Eusebius had given the Eighteenth Dynasty three hundred and forty-eight years by adding the eighty-five years of Ramesses and Menophthah to the original total of two hundred and sixty-three years, his Nineteenth Dynasty, *minus* these eighty-five years, was reduced to one hundred and fifty-two years. The Armenian Version still shows that this

was the case. By restoring the first two numbers from Africanus, we obtain this result:

|                                      |          |
|--------------------------------------|----------|
| 1. Sethos (Set-necht), . . . . .     | 51 years |
| 2. Rampses (Ramesses III), . . . . . | 61 "     |
| 3. Amenephthis, . . . . .            | 8 "      |
| 4. Ammenemes, . . . . .              | 26 "     |
| 5. Thuoris, . . . . .                | 7 "      |
| Total, . . . . .                     | 153 "    |

In the List of Eusebius, transmitted by Syncellus, the forty years of Amenephthis are taken from the forty years of Menophthah in the Eighteenth Dynasty.

Bearing in mind that one reign at least has been crowded out of the List of Africanus, and that Thuoris ought not to be counted as one of the kings of the Nineteenth Dynasty, we may assume that there were three reigns of eight, twenty, and five years respectively in this dynasty, especially as the reign of twenty-six years in the List of Eusebius evidently represents the two reigns of twenty and five years, the extra year being due to the extra months. The following list will illustrate this more plainly:

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 1. Ramesses II Miamen, . . . . .             | 66.2 years |
| 2. Menophthah, . . . . .                     | 19.6 "     |
| 3. Sethos II ( <i>Set-necht</i> ), . . . . . | 51 "       |
| 4. Rampsakes (Ramesses III), . . . . .       | 61 "       |
| 5. Ramesses IV Miamen, . . . . .             | 8 "        |
| 6. Amenephthis I, . . . . .                  | 20 "       |
| 7. Amenemes (Ramesses Amen-at?), . . . . .   | 5 "        |
| Thuoris, before era, . . . . .               | 7 "        |
| Total, . . . . .                             | 237 "      |

We have already seen how Manetho's lists were systematically changed, in order to bring the begin-

ning of the Eighteenth Dynasty down to 1648 B. C., the date of the Exodus as fixed by Josephus, and how Thuoris was substituted for Phuoro, or King Nile. When we consider that these dates have nothing but the erroneous computation of Josephus to support them, and are dependent upon the ridiculous and untenable contention that the Hamite invaders of Egypt were the Children of Israel, it seems incredible that men of science should consider them worthy of serious consideration. The error has also made itself felt in Babylonian and Assyrian chronology.

Petrie, for example, places the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty at 1587 B. C., basing himself upon what he supposes to be "absolute dates" calculated by the Viennese astronomer, Dr. Mahler, from the risings of Sirius and the new moons. Dr. Mahler, for instance, fixes the fifty-three years and eleven months of Thothmes III between March 20th, 1503 B. C., and February 14th, 1449 B. C. Rev. A. H. Sayce tells us that this "Viennese astronomer," with the help of certain astronomical "data" furnished by the monuments, determined the exact date of the reign of Ramesses II as extending from 1348 B. C. to 1281 B. C. Now, these dates are false and contradictory upon their face. In the first place, they allow but one hundred and one years between the death of Thothmes III and the accession, as sole-king, of Ramesses II, when the actual interval was one hundred and thirty-nine years. Such inaccuracies are irreconcilable with absolute astronomical dates. In the second place, the date 1281 B. C. for the end of

the reign of Ramesses II would bring the Exodus (which took place in the fifth year of the reign of Menophthah) within two hundred and sixty-six years of the Building of Solomon's Temple. There were four hundred and eighty years between the Exodus and the Building of the Temple, and the history and genealogies of this period can not be compressed within the narrow compass of two hundred and sixty-six years. Solomon commenced to build the Temple about two years before the accession of Shishak, the first king of the Twenty-second Dynasty, for this dynasty ruled from 1009 B. C. to 789 B. C. The last king of the Twenty-first Dynasty (Psusannos, or *P'su-cha-nut II*) reigned thirty-five years. Solomon made affinity with this king, and took his daughter in marriage. "And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month of Zif, which is the second month, that he began to build the house of the Lord." Is it not evident that Solomon selected this Sothiac period of one season of four months, or four hundred and eighty years, as a fixed date for his great work? We are expressly told that his wisdom excelled that of all the children of the east country, "and all the wisdom of Egypt." According to these dates, Solomon mounted the throne about 1014 B. C., or five years before the accession of Shishak. The Scriptures manifest the agreement of this chronology and that of ancient Egypt; for we are told, *first*, that Pharaoh, king of Egypt (Psusan-

nos II), had gone up and taken Gezer, and burnt it with fire, and slain the Canaanites that dwelt in the city, and given it as a present unto his daughter, Solomon's wife; *second*, that Hadad fled to Pharaoh, king of Egypt (Shishak), who received him with favor, and gave him to wife the sister of his own wife, Tahpenes, the queen; and, *third*, that Jeroboam, when Solomon sought to kill him, fled to Egypt, unto Shishak, king of Egypt, and was in Egypt until the death of Solomon. Now, as Shishak took Jerusalem in the fifth year of Rehoboam, it follows that Solomon's reign could not have exceeded twenty-one or twenty-two years, although he is given forty years. I admit that the numbers 40, 80, 120, etc., as used in the Scriptures, are indefinite and approximate only; but, aside from this, it is inconceivable how scientists, or astronomers either, can slash away at chronology without paying the least attention to contemporaneous history and well-established synchronisms. A moment's reflection will convince any impartial student of the fallacy of attempting to place Ramesses I at the beginning of the era 1324 B. C., as Petrie does. Let us see where this would land us:

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Era of Menophres, . . . . .                        | 1324 B. C. |
| Ramesses I, . . . . .                              | 1          |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1323 B. C. |
| Sethos I, . . . . .                                | 59         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1264 B. C. |
| Ramesses II (66 years + 4 + 2 + 2 months), . . . . | 67         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1197 B. C. |
| Menophthah, to Exodus, . . . . .                   | 4          |
|  | <hr/>      |
| Exodus, . . . . .                                  | 1193 B. C. |

This sort of chronology (?) would leave exactly one hundred and eighty-two years between the Exodus and the Building of the Temple, which is preposterous on its face.

Dr. Mahler's dates are not much better than these. Lepsius, years ago, demonstrated that the so-called "data derived from the monuments" were either misunderstood or altogether unreliable. Astronomical observations were not recorded on public monuments; but were registered on *papyri*, and preserved in the libraries of the temples. The inscriptions in the tombs, etc., were made by men who understood but little about astronomy; whereas the observations of the "risings of the stars," etc., preserved in the temples, were made by professional astronomers. As to the "new moons" (monumental mention of which is exceedingly rare), every one knows that they recur in the same order at stated intervals, and can not be relied on except as "checks." Again, we must know how the regnal years appearing on chance monuments agree with the reigns to be found in the lists. Thus Amenophthis IV dated from his accession as joint-king with his father, Amenophthis III. Manetho gave Amenophthis III the thirty-one years and ten months of his sole-reign, and Amenophthis IV the four or five years of their joint-reign; but, on the other hand, he assigned the four or five years of the joint-reign of Amenophthis IV and his daughter to the latter. In like manner, the fifty-nine years and two months of Sethos I include his long joint-reign with his father, Ramesses I, for the one year and four

months given to the latter in the lists end at the accession of Sethos as joint-king. On the contrary, the fifty-nine years and two months of Sethos I extend from his accession as joint-king to his death.

Attempts have been made to use the monumental mention of *Sed*-festivals (*heb-sed*) for chronological purposes, but without sufficient examination and study of the subject. A thirty years' festival does not, as some suppose, correspond to a Sothiac week. Brugsch in his latest work (*Ægyptologie*) called attention to the fact that the Egyptians called a Sothiac month *han-ti*, a dual form equivalent to *two hans*. A *han*, therefore, equals sixty years. Just as the earth was divided into an upper and lower hemisphere, so was the Sothiac month; the upper *han* being known as *har*, the lower as *sed*. Now, it is apparent that the festival of the beginning of the first *han* of sixty years would be merged in the more important festival of the beginning of a new Sothiac month; but the celebration of the first *Sed*-festival, which occurred at the middle of each *han-ti*, would be an important chronological event. The monuments mention the "first" *hib-sed* (lit. *sop top*, "first time") in contradistinction to the "second" *Sed*-festival, which was celebrated at the middle of the second *han*.

For example, it will be seen that the first *Sed*-festival, at the middle of the *han-ti* of Pa-chons, 3224 B. C., fell in the first year of the reign of *Tat-ka-ra As-as*; and the celebration of this "first *Sed*-festival by King *Tat-ka-ra*, beloved by the spirits of *An-nut*," etc., is mentioned on an alabaster vase. The second

*Sed*-festival of this Sothiac month, 3194 B. C., was certainly celebrated in the thirty-first year of this king's reign.

Coming down to the *han-ti* of *Pa-uoni*, the first *hib-sed*, 3104 B. C., fell in the thirteenth year of the reign of Phiops I. A large inscription at Hammamat, dated in the eighteenth year (*ren-pa-et em ach-et*) of this king's reign, mentions the "first *Sed*-festival." This date shows that *Meri-ra* reigned jointly with *Teta* or some other ruler for five years, probably during his minority. Manetho gave these five years to *Teta* (Othoes for Tithoes). "*Ren-pa-et em ach-et*," therefore, refers to the "year after" his accession as joint-king. The "second" *hib-sed* of this *han-ti*, 3074 B. C., fell in the forty-third year of *Meri-ra's* reign; but on the monuments it would be recorded in his forty-eighth year.

The first *hib-sed* of the *han-ti* of *Épiphi*, 2984 B. C., coincided with the seventy-third year of Phiops II, and an inscription of his (adjoining that of Unas) at Elephantinè mentions a *Sed*-festival. The second *hib-sed* of this month, 2954 B. C., divided the twelve years assigned to Nitokris into equal halves. In the list bearing the name of Eratosthenes this queen has only six, instead of twelve, years. The first *hib-sed* of *Mes-har-i*, 2864 B. C., as we have seen in the Eleventh Dynasty, was duly celebrated in the second year of *Neb-taui-ra Menthu-hotep*.

Thus four successive *Sed*-festivals are mentioned by the kings in whose reigns they occurred according

to our astronomical dates. The *Sed*-festivals mentioned in the inscriptions of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties, when correctly applied, are bound to agree with the astronomical dates given; but we must always bear in mind that the regnal years which appear on the monuments do not, and can not in many instances, agree with the chronological numbers employed by Manetho. Thus the first *Sed*-festival of Pachons, 1764 B. C., coincides with the second year of the reign assigned to Mephres; but how do we know that this queen actually dated her monuments from the year 1765? Manetho traces his chronology through Amessis, the sister of Amenophthis I and wife of Thothmes I, and Mephres, the daughter of Amessis and Thothmes I, ignoring Thothmes I and Thothmes II. It is significant, however, that Mephres claimed this festival.

The first *hib-sed* of Payni, 1644 B. C., fell in the fourth year of Anchesenaten's reign—that is, about the end of the joint-reign of Achenaten and his daughter; but no mention of it has yet been found.

The first *hib-sed* of Epiphi, 1524 B. C., occurred in the thirty-eighth year of the reign of Ramesses II. and this king seems to have celebrated it with great pomp in different parts of Egypt; but when we come to the second *Sed*-festival of this month, 1494 B. C., the coincidence is remarkable, for Menophthah mounted the throne as sole monarch in the year 1495 B. C., and celebrated this festival in the second year of his reign. This agrees exactly with Seti's epoch-

reign of twenty-three years after the epoch 1584 B. C., which can not possibly be ascribed to chance.

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Epoch of Epiphi, . . . . .                  | 1584 B. C. |
| Sethos I, as epoch-king Osiropis, . . . . . | 23         |
|   | <hr/>      |
|   | 1561 B. C. |
| Ramesses II Miamen, . . . . .               | 66         |
|   | <hr/>      |
| Beginning of Menophthah's reign, . . . . .  | 1495 B. C. |

The Exodus, which took place in the fifth year of this king's reign, 1491 B. C., will be treated of in another chapter. The genealogical succession upon the throne, as officially recognized by Ramesses III at Medinet Habu, was: 1. Menophthah; 2. Sethos II; 3. *Set-necht*; and 4. Ramesses III. We know from the monuments that Sethos II reigned jointly with Menophthah for several years. If the "death of the first-born" is to be taken literally, and not symbolically, Menophthah's eldest son, who sat on the throne with his father, perished before the Exodus. There are facts going to show that Sethos II was born *after* his father began to reign. Thus the invasion of the Libyan and Mediterranean nations occurred in his fifth year, the year of the Exodus; the settlement of certain *Shasu*, or Beduin, tribes in the deserted district of Goshen, by royal permission, took place, according to the official report, in the eighth year; and Manetho tells us that Sethos II was but five years old when Menophthah and his army voluntarily retired to Ethiopia, where they remained thirteen years. At the end of this period Menophthah and Sethos returned to Egypt. each at the head of a separate army. Although Sethos was only eighteen

years of age at the time, it is certain that his father had raised him up as joint-king. Now, as Manetho gave Menophthah nineteen years and six months, he must have given the joint-reign to Sethos II; for the seven years previous to the settlement of the *Shasu* tribes in Goshen and the thirteen years of the exile in Ethiopia give us a reign of at least nineteen years and six months. After the Canaanites had been expelled from Egypt and pursued to the bounds of Syria, Menophthah found time to construct a funerary temple out of material taken from a building erected by Amenhotep III, and to set up a granite tablet recording his great victory, or, we should say, his son's victory; and Sethos II had time to erect monuments, carve statues of himself, and prepare a rock-cut tomb in the Biban-el-moluk. But, unless the Harris papyrus refers to these ill-fated thirteen years, the short period of peace and prosperity which followed this victory was succeeded by another period of anarchy and confusion "lasting many years," during which a Syrian—that is, *Chal*—named *Ar-su* usurped the government, and tyrannized over the people. It can not be denied that there is a striking resemblance between the names of Manetho's Osarsiph and this *Arsu*, for the *ar* of *Arsu*, like the *ar* of *Osar*, is written with the sign of the eye.

In his chronological list of legitimate kings, Manetho gave Sethos II the entire fifty-one years from the end of Menophthah's reign, 1476 B. C., to the beginning of *Set-necht's* reign, 1425 B. C. But it is certain that he also mentioned the *actual rulers* dur-

ing this period, as he had done with respect to *Achenaten* and his successors. The author of the pseudo-Sothis list made use of a number of these reigns to fill out the first portion of his bogus list, where they now appear immediately before the seven kings of the Twentieth Dynasty. We copy the following:

|                              |                  |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| Date of Exodus, . . . . .    | 1491 B. C.       |
| 11. Akeseophthres, . . . . . | 13               |
|                              | <hr/> 1478 B. C. |
| 12. Agchoreus, . . . . .     | 9                |
|                              | <hr/> 1469 B. C. |
| 13. Armiyses, . . . . .      | 4                |
|                              | <hr/> 1465 B. C. |
| 14. Chamois, . . . . .       | 12               |
|                              | <hr/> 1453 B. C. |
| 15. Miamus, . . . . .        | 14               |
|                              | <hr/> 1439 B. C. |
| 16. Amesesis, . . . . .      | 65               |
|                              | <hr/> 1374 B. C. |
| 17. Oyses, . . . . .         | 50               |
|                              | <hr/> 1324 B. C. |

These names are so corrupt that it is difficult to identify them, and they no longer succeed one another in their original order.

Among these, "Chamois" is the epoch-title of the king who ruled at Thebes from 1464 B. C. to 1452 B. C., for Chamois is a very accurate transcription of *Cha-m-uas*, "Crowned in Thebes." "Oyses" was originally Sethosis, whose fifty-one years have been changed to fifty. This reign appears a second time as No. 58, Thuoris, fifty years.

Amesesis was originally Ramesses, the Rampses of Eusebius, with sixty-five years, and, strange to say, Nos. 53 and 54 of this bogus list, before the first was changed by Goar, stood thus:

|                                       |          |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| 53. Kertos (Sethos), . . . . .        | 16 years |
| 54. Rampsis (Ramesses III), . . . . . | 45 "     |
| Total, . . . . .                      | 61 "     |

These are the identical sixty-one years assigned by Manetho to Rampsakes in his chronological list, showing that Sethos II has the fifty-one years between the reign of Menophthah and the accession of *Set-necht*, and that Rampsakes has the sixteen years of *Set-necht*, in addition to his own forty-five. The emendation of Goar, whereby Kertos received twenty years to fill out the interval between A. M. 4187 and A. M. 4207, agrees with the sixty-six years assigned to Rampsis by Eusebius.

The thirteen years of Akesephthres naturally suggest the thirteen years of Menophtah's voluntary exile in Ethiopia. It can not be a freak of chance that when they are placed immediately after the true date of the Exodus, the epoch-reign "Chamois" coincides with the epoch of Messori, 1464 B. C.—for the apparent difference of one year is due to the odd months and days—and the reign of Ramesses, the first king of the Twentieth Dynasty, *coincides exactly* with the great Sothiac Era, 1324 B. C. It is evident that these names were arranged according to the epochs before they were transferred, and that the forger of the pseudo-Sothis List knew that Manetho's Lists were so

arranged. The fifty-fifth king of the pseudo-Sothis List is "Amenses, who is also Ammenemes, twenty-six years," which shows that the reigns of Amenophthes and Amenemes had been amalgamated, after Amenophthes was put in the place of Ramesses IV; for Amenses is Smendes, the first king of the Twenty-first Dynasty. The insertion of Thuoris as the last king of this dynasty crowded out Ramesses IV. The Lists of Africanus and Eusebius can be harmonized as follows:

|                             |                             |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 3. Sethos, . . . . 51 years | 3. Sethos, . . . . 51 years |
| 4. Ramps-hakes, . 61 "      | 4. Rampses, . . . 61 "      |
| 5. Ramesses IV, . 8 "       | 5. (Ramesses), . . 8 "      |
| 6. Amenephthis, . 20 "      | 6. Amenepthes, } 26 "       |
| 7. Amenemes, . . 5 "        | 7. Amenemes, } 26 "         |
| Add Thuoris, . 7 "          | Add Thuoris, . 7 "          |
| Total, . . . 152 "          | Total, . . . 152 "          |

Thus Ramesses III reigned forty-five years, and his three sons thirty-three years, together seventy-eight years.

Just as Manetho, in the Eighteenth Dynasty, traced the chronology through *Achenaten* and his two daughters, giving them thirty-six years and nine months, but in the official list gave Horus these thirty-six years and nine months, so did he, in the Nineteenth Dynasty, enumerate the actual rulers from the date of the Flight of Menophthah to the accession of "Sethosis and Ramesses," also showing how the numbers had been apportioned among the kings of the recognized official line.

## EPOCH-REIGNS OF MANETHO'S SECOND SOTHIAIC CYCLE

But little remains to be said about the epoch-reigns of Manetho's Second Sothiac Cycle. At the close of the Twelfth Dynasty we were forced to bid farewell to Eratosthenes, whose epoch-reigns afforded us so much valuable assistance in the First Cycle. For the entire period of four hundred and ninety-three years between the Twelfth and Hyksos Dynasties the separate reigns are altogether wanting in the Manethonian Lists. It is true that the throne-titles of nearly all the kings of the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Dynasties appear in whole or in part upon fragments of the Turin papyrus, and that in several instances where the corresponding portions of the papyrus are not lost, the phrase "*ari-en-ef em su-temiu*" serves to mark the epoch-reigns; but these throne-titles seldom afford any clue to the proper, or *sa-ra*, names of the kings, except where they are revealed by independent monuments bearing both the throne and *sa-ra* titles.

Although we have to grope our way without the assistance of the epoch-reigns of Eratosthenes, and without the proper names and separate reigns of the kings, it is in this period that the papyrus shows most satisfactorily that the Sothiac epochs were carefully marked, and the reigns accurately registered in years, months, and days. We have shown that the title, *Ian-u .Ab*, assumed by the Theban King *Uah-ab-ra*, marks him, beyond a doubt, as a contemporary of the

Hyksos King *Pa-ian*, who reigned thirty years after the great epoch of Phamenoth, 2064 B. C., under the epoch-title Rohk-les, or Archles. Is it not significant that up to this point (this *ian* or *ab*) we find titles compounded with *cha*, "rising," such as *Cha-anch-ra*, *Cha-nofer-ra*, and *Cha-hotep-ra*; but that the very moment the sun turns this point (*ianu ab*) and begins to descend, the element *cha* disappears? To contend that this was an accident or chance is to beg the question. We might as well contend that Psammetichos I, whose reign reached to within six years of the epoch 604 B. C., one cycle later, accidentally or by mere chance chose the identical title, *Uah-ab-ra*, borne by his predecessor of the Sixteenth Dynasty. An epoch-reign, such as that of "Archles, thirty years," is a wonderful thing, for it bears upon its face an absolute date, astronomically ascertained and fixed, and all we need to do to obtain the most accurate chronology is simply to place it where it belongs. The following Sothiac list of the Second Cycle, therefore, may be accepted as accurate. The epoch-reign of Amenemes I, before the Era 2784 B. C., has been given and fully explained in the First Cycle. Beginning at this era, the main or chronological line is as follows:

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Era of Amenemes, . . . . .                                | 2784 B. C. |
| Usertosis, including last 13 years of Amenemes, . . . . . | 46         |
|   | <hr/>      |
|   | 2738 B. C. |
| Amenemes II, . . . . .                                    | 38         |
|   | <hr/>      |
|   | 2700 B. C. |
| Usertosis II, . . . . .                                   | 17         |
|   | <hr/>      |
|   | 2683 B. C. |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <i>Brought forward</i> , . . . . .                               | 2683 B. C. |
| Usertosis III, before epoch, as Phuoro, . . . . .                | 19         |
| Epoch of Paopi, . . . . .  | 2664 B. C. |
| Usertosis III, after epoch, . . . . .                            | 19         |
|  | 2645 B. C. |
| Amenemes III, or Marea, . . . . .                                | 42         |
|  | 2603 B. C. |
| Amenemes IV, . . . . .   | 9          |
|  | 2594 B. C. |
| Skeminofria, . . . . .   | 4          |
|  | 2590 B. C. |
| Thirteenth Dynasty, <i>Chu-tani-ra</i> , . . . . .               | 41         |
|  | 2549 B. C. |
| Thirteenth Dynasty, <i>Sochem-ka-ra</i> , as Siphthah, . . . . . | 5          |
| Epoch of Athyr, . . . . .  | 2544 B. C. |
| Thirteenth Dynasty, after epoch, . . . . .                       | 196        |
|  | 2348 B. C. |
| Fifteenth Dynasty, . . . . .                                     | 251        |
|  | 2097 B. C. |
| Sethos, or Saitea, . . . . .                                     | 19         |
|  | 2078 B. C. |
| Pa-ian, before epoch, . . . . .                                  | 14         |
|  | 2064 B. C. |
| Pa-ian, after epoch, as Archlea, . . . . .                       | 30         |
|  | 2034 B. C. |
| Apophis I, . . . . .   | 61         |
|  | 1973 B. C. |
| Sethos, before epoch, . . . . .                                  | 29         |
|  | 1944 B. C. |
| Sethos, after epoch, as Anas, . . . . .                          | 20         |
|  | 1924 B. C. |
| Iannas, . . . . .  | 50         |
|  | 1874 B. C. |
| Apophis II, . . . . .  | 37         |
|  | 1837 B. C. |

---

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| <i>Brought forward</i> , . . . . .               | 1837 B. C.       |
| Chebros, before epoch, . . . . .                 | 13               |
|  | <hr/> 1824 B. C. |
| Aahmes, after epoch of Pachons, . . . . .        | 25               |
|  | <hr/> 1799 B. C. |
| Amenophis I, . . . . .                           | 14               |
|  | <hr/> 1785 B. C. |
| Amesses, sister, . . . . .                       | 20               |
|  | <hr/> 1765 B. C. |
| Mephres, daughter, . . . . .                     | 22               |
|  | <hr/> 1743 B. C. |
| Mephra-Tuthmosis, . . . . .                      | 13               |
|  | <hr/> 1730 B. C. |
| Tuthmosis, before epoch of Payni, . . . . .      | 26               |
|  | <hr/> 1704 B. C. |
| Amenophis II, after epoch, as Harmais, . . . . . | 4                |
|  | <hr/> 1700 B. C. |
| Tuthmosis IV, . . . . .                          | 10               |
|  | <hr/> 1690 B. C. |
| Amenophis III, . . . . .                         | 32               |
|  | <hr/> 1658 B. C. |
| Achenaten, or Acherres, . . . . .                | 12               |
|  | <hr/> 1646 B. C. |
| Anchenaten, his daughter, . . . . .              | 12               |
|  | <hr/> 1634 B. C. |
| Anchesaten, another daughter, . . . . .          | 13               |
|  | <hr/> 1621 B. C. |
| Ramesses I, . . . . .                            | 1                |
|  | <hr/> 1620 B. C. |
| Sethos, before epoch of Epiphi, . . . . .        | 36               |
|  | <hr/> 1584 B. C. |
| Sethos, after epoch, as "Osiropis," . . . . .    | 23               |
|  | <hr/> 1561 B. C. |
| Ramesses Miamen, . . . . .                       | 66               |
|  | <hr/> 1495 B. C. |

|  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| <i>Brought forward</i> , . . . . .           | 1495 B. C.        |
| Menophthah, . . . . .                        | 19                |
|  | <u>1476 B. C.</u> |
| Sethos II, etc., before epoch, . . . . .     | 12                |
|  | <u>1464 B. C.</u> |
| "Chamois," . . . . .                         | 12                |
|  | <u>1452 B. C.</u> |
| Sethos, after Chamois (51-24), . . . . .     | 27                |
|  | <u>1425 B. C.</u> |
| Rampsakes, . . . . .                         | 61                |
|  | <u>1364 B. C.</u> |
| Ramesses IV (sole reign), . . . . .          | 8                 |
|  | <u>1356 B. C.</u> |
| Amenephthes, . . . . .                       | 20                |
|  | <u>1336 B. C.</u> |
| Amenemes, . . . . .                          | 5                 |
|  | <u>1331 B. C.</u> |
| Ramesses, as epoch-king "Thuoris," . . . . . | 7                 |
|  | <u>1324 B. C.</u> |
| Era of Menophres, . . . . .                  |                   |

### THE PERIOD OF JOSEPH'S ADMINISTRATION IN EGYPT, IN THE LIGHT OF THE TEL-EL-AMARNA CLAY-TABLETS

We have seen that Ham and Japheth were racial governments, established in the Delta about 2448 B. C., and that the names *'Adamu* and *Ja-petu* are unmistakably and distinctively Egyptian. The remaining "son of Noah," Shem, was likewise a government established by Shemites in the Delta about the same time. The name Shem is also unmistakably Egyptian. It is simply *shem-u*, "aliens, foreigners," which has come down to us unchanged in the Coptic "shemmo," which has the same meaning. It follows

that the “sons” of this Shem, such as Elam, or Persia, Assur, or Assyria, Aram, or Syria, etc., could not have been individuals, but were likewise nations or governments.

The conquest of Lower Egypt by the '*Aamu* fell with the greatest force upon the *Shem-u*, who were established in Goshen and vicinity, and we accordingly find that Shem and Japheth retired backwards—that is, up the Nile—to cover the nakedness or weakness of Noah. We are told that “Shem was a hundred years old, and begat Arphaxad two years after the flood.” “Arphaxad begat Salah, and Salah begat Eber.”

Now, before we analyze and explain this name Eber, we will, for illustration, examine the immediate posterity of Ham. We are told that the “sons of Ham” were Cush, Mizraim, Phut, and Canaan. These are so plainly the names of national governments, that no scholar would even dream of calling them individuals. In Cush we see the *Kashi* established in Elam and Babylonia, '*Aamu* pure and simple; in Mizraim, or the two Mizors, the Hyksos government over Upper and Lower Egypt, under the Seventeenth Dynasty; and in Canaan, the people of Kananna or Kinachi, the land of Canaan. The Hittites (Heth, *Cheta*), who afterwards became so powerful and celebrated, were derived from the '*Aamu* through the Canaanites, for Moses tells us explicitly that “Canaan begat Sidon, his first-born, and Heth, and the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgasite, and the Hivite, and the Arkite,” etc.; “and afterward

were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad." Here Sidon, the famous city, and Heth, the Hittites, are plainly not individuals, and the writer, recognizing the fact, goes over to the Jebusites, Amorites, Girgasites, etc. The border of these nations originally was from Sidon to Gaza; but during the period now under consideration the Hittites were north of the Amorites in the region of the Cappadocian Mountains. If we look upon Ham and Canaan as individuals, it seems strange that the son was cursed for the sin of the father; but when we consider that Ham fraternized with the 'Aamu invaders of Egypt, and eventually founded a dynasty which governed Egypt two hundred and sixty years, it is natural that the Egyptians afterwards slaked their anger upon these people in Canaan and Syria. The kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty avenged themselves upon the unfortunate Canaanites, and the children of Eber completed the work by almost exterminating them to the very roots.

It is not necessary to decide where actual individuals first succeeded governments in the long list of the "generations" of Adam contained in Genesis; but it can not escape the attention of the most casual reader of the Bible that even *after the Exodus* the tribes of Israel are sometimes introduced as individuals; for example, after the death of Joshua we read in the first chapter of the Book of Judges:

"And Judah said unto Simeon, his brother, Come up to me into my lot, that we may fight against the Canaanites; and I likewise will go with thee into thy

lot. So Simeon went with him. And Judah went up; and the Lord delivered the Canaanites and Perizzites into their hands: and they slew of them in Bezek ten thousand men."

Here, where Palestine itself was the scene of action, and the events described comparatively near in time, even those who insist upon a literal construction of the text do not pretend that Judah and Simeon were *individuals*, merely because they appear as *brothers speaking* to one another, and using *personal* pronouns, etc.; but they bend the plain meaning of the words in order to make them conform to the actual facts. It is different, however, where the historical events, with which the narrative must agree in order to be true, took place, at much earlier dates, in distant countries like Egypt, for instance; for the revisers, interpreters, and embellishers of the ancient text have in almost every instance mistaken the names of governments, nations, tribes, etc., for individuals. Bearing in mind that Bible chronology prior to the Exodus is Egyptian chronology, we find that Arphaxad was born two years after the Hyksos Invasion, and Jacob about one year after the Expulsion of the Hyksos. The birth of each follows immediately after the destruction of a pre-existing government. What does this indicate?

Among the nations and tribes arrayed against Thothmes III at Megiddo, in the twenty-third year of his reign (1732 B. C.), were the people of *Jacob-el*. A catalogue of the various people captured by this king after the surrender of the city, engraved upon

one of the propyla of the Temple of Karnak, has fortunately come down to us. The superscription, according to Brugsch, reads as follows:

"This is the catalogue of the inhabitants of Upper Ruthen (Canaan), whom His Holiness (Thothmes III) captured in the hostile town of Megiddo. His Holiness carried away their children as living prisoners to the city of Thebes, to fill the house of his father, Amen, . . . on the first victorious campaign," etc.

Now, the one hundred and second name in this catalogue is "*Jacob-el*" (*Iakop-el*, not *Iakop-ar*), and, strange to say, the same name appears on scarabs of the Ilyksos type found in Egypt, written as follows: *Sa ra Iakop-el ta anch*, "Son of Ra, *Jacob-el*, giving life," etc.

These scarabs are like those of the *Hyk-satu Ach-ian*, or "Iannos," and unquestionably belong to the same period. The title, "Son of Ra, giving life," indicates that *Jacob-el* claimed to be a Pharaoh, perhaps a successor in Canaan of the unfortunate Ilyksos King, Apophis II.

The government of the Israelites, like that of the Egyptians, was modeled after the solar system, with Israel as Ra, or central sun, and the twelve tribes as the signs of the Zodiac, or months.

This appears incidentally from Joseph's second dream, where Jacob and his wife and sons are symbolized as the sun, moon, and stars. In the dream the sun, moon, and eleven stars made obeisance to Joseph, the twelfth star. Joseph told this dream to

his father. Jacob rebuked him, saying: "What is this dream that thou hast dreamed? Shall I and thy mother and thy brethren indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee to the earth?"

We have seen that the Hyksos kings in Egypt assumed the name of their "lord god" Sutech, to wit, *Set*, *Set-nubti*, *Set-an*, etc. Can we not safely assume that they continued this custom in Canaan, immediately after their expulsion from Egypt? Petrie sees some connection between the name *Jacob-el* and the Syrian god Jacob, who, he says, "is otherwise known as *Yacob-el* in the list of Thothmes III, and Baal Akabos on an altar of the second century A. D."

This is an error as to the catalogue of Thothmes III, which is a list of the *inhabitants* of various places; but Baal Akabos identifies Jacob with Sutech through Bel, or lord.

All the posterity of Shem, prior to Jacob or Israel, were born during the five hundred and eleven years of 'Aamu domination over Egypt. The death of Shem occurred about the time of the Hyksos Expulsion. The name of Eber, who is called "the father of the Hebrews," appears on monuments of the Sixteenth, Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and Twentieth Dynasties, as *Aper-u*, or *Eper-u*. These Hebrews dwelt in the land of Goshen and in the district now known as the Wady Tumilat, where they pastured their flocks and attended to Pharaoh's horses. They were the descendants of the original *Shemu*, and many of them remained in their old seats after the Exodus. In the thirty-second year of Ramesses III, or about

1394 B. C., they are mentioned in the great Harris papyrus as "settled people," dwelling in Heliopolis or vicinity, and they are again mentioned under Ramesses IV.

According to the Bible account, the "Dispersion" took place in the days of Peleg, the son of Eber. We must, therefore, seek the Biblical Eber in Egypt, and not in Babylonia. The Shemites who remained in Egypt after the Dispersion continued to bear the old name of "*Aper-u*;" but those that emigrated to other countries naturally assumed different names. From the Egyptian point of view the chief division of the *Shemu* was into *Aperu*, or "settled people," and *Abramu*, or nomads.

*Aper*, or *Eper*, the root from which *Aper-u*, or *Aper-i-u*, is derived, has the fundamental meaning of "settled," "provided for," etc. *Abram*, on the contrary, has the meaning of "migrating," "roaming," "wandering," etc., and is derived from the name of a certain species of migratory fish found in the Nile. The name of this fish has come down to us in the Greek form, "Abramis." One of the offices held by Amten, who lived at the close of the Third Dynasty, was that of "*abram*," so called because an *abram*, in the discharge of his official duties, moved from place to place like our circuit judges in former times. In Amten's tomb *abram* is written with a hieroglyph representing this migratory fish. Thus *Eber* and *Abram*, before they were mistaken for persons, represented the two divisions of the Egyptian *Shemu*, to wit, the "seated people" and the nomads. The ancient Ger-

mans likewise made a distinction between Saxons (Sassen) or "seated people," and Suabians (Suevi from *schweben*) or "wandering people." The *migratory* Shemites, after leaving Egypt, roamed over the pastures of Canaan and Syria, and, arriving at the banks of the Euphrates, continued on down that stream until they came to Lower Babylonia. We are told that "Haran died before his father, Terah, in the land of his nativity, in Ur of the Chaldees," and that Terah took Abram and Lot and went forth from Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan, and came to Haran of Mesopotamia and dwelt there.

Thus Bible history proper begins about 1971 B. C., when Abram and Lot removed from Mesopotamia to take up their abode in Canaan. Premising that the date of the Exodus was four hundred and eighty years, or four Sothiac months, before the building of the Temple, we will first endeavor to accurately fix the length of the "Sojourn in Egypt;" for many, shutting their eyes to the express statements of the Bible, still persist in fixing it at four hundred or four hundred and thirty years.

The Septuagint, which dates from circa 250 B. C., reads thus: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt *and in the land of Canaan*, was four hundred and thirty years." (Exodus xii, 40.)

The Samaritan Pentateuch agrees with this, except that the *order* of the countries is reversed, to wit, "*who dwelt in the land of Canaan and in the land of Mizraim.*"

The text of Exodus used by Paul read the same

way, because he found the interval between the Covenant with Abram and the Law at Sinai to be four hundred and thirty years. (Galatians iii, 17.)

Josephus says the Hebrews "left Egypt in the month of Xanthicus, on the fifteenth day of the lunar month, four hundred and thirty years after our forefather Abraham came into Canaan, but two hundred and fifteen years after Jacob removed into Egypt." (Antiquities, Book II, Chapter xv, Section 2.)

Eusebius, in his Chronicon, also assigns two hundred and fifteen years only to the whole time of the Sojourn in Egypt. He makes the period from the first year of Abram to the Exodus five hundred and five years, and the period from the Covenant to the Exodus four hundred and thirty years. It is perfectly evident that in the so-called "Authorized Text," where verse 40 now reads, "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years," the words, "in the land of Canaan," have been negligently or intentionally omitted. Genesis xv, 13, which reads, "Know thou beforehand that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land not their own, and that they shall bring them under bondage and afflict them four hundred years," should be read in connection with Genesis xv, 16, where it is foretold that the seed of Abraham would return in the *fourth* generation, which statement agrees with the genealogies in Genesis and Exodus. We have in a direct line Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Levi, Kohath, Amram, and Moses, seven in all, but four only in Egypt. Abraham was seventy-five years old

when he left Haran. From this date to the birth of Isaac we have twenty-five years; from the birth of Isaac to the birth of Jacob, sixty years; and from the birth of Jacob to the settlement in Goshen, one hundred and thirty years; in all two hundred and fifteen years! This would give us two hundred and fifteen years from the Covenant to the Settlement in Egypt, and two hundred and fifteen years for the Sojourn in Egypt; in all four hundred and thirty years. Thus the correct date for the Settlement in Egypt, according to Bible numbers, is 1706 B. C., or six years before the death of Thothmes III.

We have seen that Thothmes III and Amenhotep II ruled jointly for more than four years, for both were epoch-kings in 1704 B. C. The joint-reign may have extended back to 1715 B. C., when the seven years of plenty began; and it is probable that Amenhotep II was the virtual ruler at that time. The last eighty years of Joseph's life begin at this date, and end about 1635 B. C. In other words, the period of Joseph closes at the accession of *Har-em-heb* as king of Egypt. This period coincides exactly with the period of Asiatic ascendancy at the Egyptian court. This being true, what do the monuments reveal concerning the administration of an *a-don* bearing the name of Joseph? While we must admit that no monument referring to an *a-don*, or like officer, bearing this name, has yet been discovered, the Tel-el-Amarna clay-tablets show that under King Amenhotep IV, or Ach-en-res, a Mesopotamian named Dudu, or *Tutu*, did fill the office of Adon, and govern

the land in the name of Pharaoh. In this connection we can not refrain from calling attention to a remark inserted immediately after the reign of Amenophis III, or Memnon, in the pseudo-Sothis list, according to which certain Ethiopians (*Kashi*, or Cushites!) from the River Indus (?) were settled in Egypt during his reign. The remark, in its present form, is intentionally corrupt and misleading; but it was undoubtedly taken from a remark found in Manetho's "Book of Sothis." In my opinion, it originally read, in effect, that under Amenophis II, the Iudah (*Yaudah*), a tribe of Cushites, from Mesopotamia (not "Æthiopes apo Indu Potamu") were settled in Egypt. As the name Amenophthis II has been crowded out of the lists, it is probable that this remark was at first attached to his reign; but it is significant that the official correspondence of Tel-el Amarna, which dates from the reign of Amenophthis IV and the last years of the reign of Amenophthis III, refers to the "Yaudah" (*Iudah*), who were then near Mesopotamia, and preparations incident to their projected removal. It appears from this correspondence that at this time the Hittites (*Cheta*) were seated north of Aleppo and Tunip (Tennib), and the Amorites (*Amurri*) immediately south of them, so that the land of *Amurri* could not have been far from Padan-aram, where Jacob reared his family, and the "Yaudah," who were about to be removed, were in or near the land of *Amurri*; in fact, according to Rev. A. H. Sayce, the type of the Israelites, as shown by the monumental representations, is distinctively *Amorite*. The use of the term

“Ethiopians”—that is, *Kashi*, or Cushites—is explained by the monuments, which again and again mention the '*Aamu* of this region; for Cush was a son of Ham, and Manetho, who wrote in Greek, necessarily used the Greek word for *Kashi*. The all-important point is, that Manetho, in his list of the Eighteenth Dynasty, and in connection with a king named Amenhotep, mentioned the settlement of certain Mesopotamians in Egypt; for Ethiopians, or *Kashi*, from the river Indus is an absurdity upon its face. Of course, the Israelites, as we know them, were not *Kashi*, or Ethiopians; but as they came from Lower Babylonia, the home, *par excellence*, of these people, they were naturally classed with them, and described as Cushites by the Egyptians.

The names compounded with “yah” (*iah, aah, io*), such as *Yahu-dah, Yah-kop, Yah-saph, Yah-petu*, etc., offer a promising field for the scientist; but we can not stop to explore it here.

If the settlement of Israel in Goshen actually took place about the beginning of the joint-reign of Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV. (ca. 1658 B. C.), we would have to shorten the period of the Sojourn in Egypt about forty-eight years, or place the Exodus towards the close of the interregnum between Menophthah's death and the accession of *Set-necht*, which could not be harmonized with the conditions and surroundings of the Bible narrative. It is safer, therefore, to provisionally follow the chronological dates, according to which the settlement in Egypt took place in the joint-reign of Amenophthis II and Thoth-

mes III, and the Exodus in the fifth year of the reign of Menophthah. The Tel-el Amarna correspondence shows conclusively that Canaan had been reduced to the condition of an Egyptian province, governed by Egyptian officials, and held in subjection by garrisons of Egyptian troops. This condition continued unimpaired from the twenty-third year of Thothmes III to the sole reign of Achenaten, a period of over seventy years. In fact, we can safely place the conquest of Canaan and Syria by Thothmes I at about 1785 B. C., so that, notwithstanding Canaan was subject to the Hyksos when Jacob was born, it was a part of Egypt when Jacob and his sons—that is, the Israelites—removed from Mesopotamia and settled there. The Bible narrative agrees with this state of things in every particular. Putiphar, to whom Joseph was sold, bears a pure Egyptian name, and is called “an officer of P'haraoh, captain of the guard, *an Egyptian*.” The name is *Pa-tu-ph'ra*, “The Gift of the Sun,” for the definite article before *Ra* excludes *Pa-tu-har*, “The Gift of Horus.” The same name, rendered Putipherah—that is, *Pa-tu-pa-ra* or *Pa-tu-pha-ra*—was borne by the priest of On (Heliopolis), the father of Asenath, Joseph's wife. The name Asenath is also Egyptian. None of these names are Hyksos, or Hamite. Joseph's title, *Saf-na-ta-pa-anchu*, “Savior of the Land of the Living,” as we have already pointed out, is likewise Egyptian. Pharaoh had taken up his residence in Memphis, which accounts for his marrying Joseph to Asenath, daughter of the priest of Heliopolis. Scarabs of Amenhotep II inform us

that he was "born at Memphis," showing that, although the Eighteenth Dynasty was Theban, Thothmes III resided at Memphis when his son and successor was born. If the Pharaoh of Joseph had been the Hyksos Apophis II, who held his court at Avaris, he would have married Joseph to a daughter of the priest of Sutech, his so-called "lord god."

At the feast given by Joseph to his brethren, tables were set apart for Joseph by himself, for his brethren by themselves, and for the Egyptians, which did eat with him, by themselves; "because the Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that is an abomination unto the Egyptians." The text describes those that ate with Joseph and his brethren as "Egyptians," and shows that a well-known custom of the Egyptians made it imperative for the Hebrews, including Joseph, to eat at separate tables. It is a mystery to me how any one, especially orthodox theologians, could so far mistake the plain meaning of the text as to place this occurrence under the Hyksos.

There can be no doubt as to where the children of Israel dwelt while in Egypt. Joseph says to his brethren: "So now it was not you that sent me hither, but God: and he hath made me a councillor (*ab*) unto Pharaoh, and lord of all his house, and a ruler throughout all the land of Egypt. Haste ye, and go up to my father, and say unto him, Thus saith thy son Joseph. . . . And thou shalt dwell in the land of Goshen, and thou shalt be near unto me." After this we read: "And they [Jacob and his sons]

came into the land of Goshen. And Joseph made ready his chariot, and went up to meet Israel, his father, to Goshen."

Joseph tells Pharaoh that his father and brethren, and their flocks and herds, are in the land of Goshen. Pharaoh directed Joseph to make them dwell in the best of the land; "in the land of Goshen let them dwell," adding, "and if thou knowest any men of activity among them, then make them rulers over my cattle." "And Joseph placed his father and his brethren, and gave them a possession in the land of Egypt, in the best of the land, in the land of Ramesses, as Pharaoh had commanded."

The land of Goshen was the district along the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, between Heliopolis and Tanis. It is here called "the land of Ramesses," which is anachronistic by nearly two hundred years; for *Seti I* and Ramesses II added a new quarter, or temple-city, to Tanis, which was called the "City of Ramesses," in honor of Ramesses I, who began to reign about 1622 B. C., and was the "new king who knew not Joseph." The new city, upon which the Israelites were forced to do so much unwilling labor, became the royal residence, and was so celebrated in the times of Moses, that the land of Goshen was named after it, "the land of Ramesses." The expression, "For every shepherd is an abomination unto the Egyptians," points unmistakably to a native Egyptian dynasty, and can not be made to fit into the period of Hyksos rule.

When Joseph went up to bury his father, he was

accompanied by a very great company, to wit: the servants of Pharaoh, the elders of his house, the elders of the land of Egypt, the house of Joseph, and his brethren, and moreover chariots and horsemen; which shows that Canaan was an Egyptian province at the time, for such a procession through a hostile country is inconceivable.

The inhabitants of Canaan regarded the Israelites as Canaanites; but they were naturally astonished to see the "joint mourning" of Egyptians and Canaanites at the threshing-floor of Atad beyond Jordan, and they called the name of the place "Abel-mizraim," in commemoration of this extraordinary event. In this compound name, Abel symbolizes the Egyptians, and Mizraim the Canaanites, or Hyksos in Canaan. "Abel and Mizraim," as here used, is equivalent to Abel and Cain. The '*Aamu*, while they governed Egypt, were called Mizraim; but afterwards, while in Canaan, they were called Cain, or Canaan. Now, strange as it may appear, a fortuitous discovery recently made in Egypt discloses exactly such a state of affairs in Egypt and Canaan as this event presupposes.

Among the inscribed clay-tablets found beneath the ruins of Ach-en-res' palace at Tel-el-Amarna are many letters or reports from the officials stationed in Canaan and Syria. These reports show that these countries to the southern boundary of the land of *Cheta*, which was north of Aleppo ('*Alebu*) and Ten-neb (*Tenep*), were Egyptian provinces, garrisoned by Egyptian troops and governed by Egyptian officials.


Owing to centuries of Hamite, or Cushite, domination, the Babylonian language and cuneiform system of writing were in common use.

According to the Babylonian chronology of Berossos (see my restoration thereof in another chapter), the Median (*'Aamu*) conquest of that region took place in the year 2348 B. C. First of all, eight Median, or Elamite, tyrants dominated Western Asia, including Canaan, two hundred and twenty-four years—that is, from 2348 B. C. to 2124 B. C. Then eleven Elamite kings, of another dynasty, ruled over Babylonia for one hundred and forty-eight years, or from 2124 B. C. to 1976 B. C. The year 1976 B. C. marks a great revolution or change of dynasty in Babylonia, for a native dynasty then succeeded the Elamite kings, and reigned (possibly in several dynasties) four hundred and fifty-eight years; that is, from 1976 B. C. to 1518 B. C. As late as 1921 B. C., however, a king of this dynasty, to wit, "Amraphel, king of Shinar" (Sumir), appears to have been tributary to Kudur-lagomer, king of Elam; for he as well as Tidal, king of Akkad (*Hyk-sat-u*) accompanied Kudur-lagomer, the great "king of kings," upon his memorable expedition to Canaan. This was in the beginning of the reign of the Hyksos King *Chi-an*, or "Iannos." Afterwards, when Amoses expelled the Hyksos from Egypt (1837 B. C.), and Tuthmoses I carried his victorious arms into Mesopotamia (*Naharuna*), which was about 1785 B. C., the kings of Elam and Babylonia were no longer willing or able to offer any resistance; on the contrary,

the kings of Babylonia sought to win the good will of Thothmes I and Thothmes III by costly presents and tribute. By the time of *Achenaten*, Assyria had grown to be as powerful as Babylonia. Assur-uballid, king of Assyria (whose "alliance extended afar off like a mountain"), carried on a friendly correspondence with Achenaten, as he had previously done with Amenophthis III. He writes to Achenaten that his father, Assur-nadin-achi, sent an embassy to Egypt with twenty talents of gold, and that the ambassadors of Achenaten had visited distant lands and journeyed to many cities.

Burna-buryas, king of Babylonia (Kar-dunyas), writes as follows: "Ever since my father and thy father conferred with one another in amity, they sent beautiful presents to one another, but did not address one another in fair and beautiful letters." He reminds the king of Egypt that, in the time of Kuri-galza, his father, the Kunachians sent word to him that they wished to rebel against the government of Egypt, and asked for his support, but he refused, saying: "If thou art estranged from the king of Egypt, my brother, and alliest thyself with another, I will not assist you." Burna-buryas adds: "Thus my father was of the same mind as myself, and would not listen to them, because of thy father."

In another letter, written by Burna-buryas to Amenhotep IV, it appears that they had agreed to have amicable dealings with one another, as their fathers had done; but Burna-buryas complains that his ministers, who had been sent to Egypt with costly



presents, had been slain and robbed in the country of Kinachi (Canaan), which was subject to Egypt, and demands that the murderers, whom he names, be summarily punished. "Slay them, and requite the blood of my messengers. If thou dost not put these men to death, the people of my country will slay thy ambassadors, and the league between us will be broken, and I will be estranged from thee."

A custom sprang up during the reign of Thothmes III which had an injurious effect upon the government and religion of Egypt.

The kings of Egypt gave their daughters in marriage to the kings of Babylonia, Assyria, and Mitanni, and, in turn, married daughters of these foreign kings. The kingdom of Mitanni, the *Maten* of the monuments, was situated on the east bank of the Euphrates in *Naharuna*, or Mesopotamia, and seems to have been separated from the country of the Amorites by the kingdom of Nuchasse, which was subject to Egypt. The letters from Dushratta, king of Mitanni, to Amenhotep III, Teie (*Ta-i*), his wife, and Amenhotep IV, their eldest son, throw a flood of light upon the history of this period. A letter to Amenhotep IV ("Napchururiya" equals *Nofercheperu-ra*), informs us that Thothmes IV, the father of Amenhotep III, sent to Artatama, the grandfather of Dushratta, asking the hand of his daughter in marriage. Dushratta claims that Thothmes IV sent five times, yea, six times, before Artatama would consent to give her up. At last, however, Artatama yielded, and sent his daughter to Egypt, to become

the wife of the Egyptian king, accompanied by a train of handmaidens.

Some time after this, Amenhotep III (Nipmuaria, Nimutriya, Nimmuria, and Nimmuaria=*Neb-ma-ra*) sent an embassy to Satarna to ask for his daughter, Dushratta's "darling sister."

"At last, five times and six times he sends, and my father gave her with a train of handmaidens."

"When Nimmuria, thy father, sent to me, and asked for my daughter, I did not refuse, but answered favorably. I spoke to his messenger as follows: 'I am ready to give her; thy messenger has come among my children, and I have seen the present which thou hast sent . . . and I will bestow upon her the dowry due to thee . . . and because I am honored, I do not refuse to give her.'"

A scarab of the time of Amenhotep III contains an inscription showing that, in the tenth year of this Pharaoh, Satarna, king of *Naharuna*, sent his daughter *Kirugipa* (Giluchipa) to Egypt with a train of three hundred and seventeen handmaidens.

The daughter of Dushratta mentioned in the above letter, although sent for by Amenhotep III, was bestowed upon Amenhotep IV, who then became joint-regent. This was, according to Manetho, about four years before the death of Amenhotep III, or after he had reigned thirty-one years and ten months.

The young queen bore the name of Taduchipa, which is equivalent to the Egyptian *Tai-ti*, for "chipa" does not seem to be an essential part of the name.

The "chief wife" of Amenhotep III, however, was *Tai*, the daughter of *Juia* and *Tuia*, king and queen of *Naharuna*.

Dushratta, king of Mitanni, addresses Amenhotep IV as his "son-in-law," and sends greetings to Teie, "my sister and thy mother," and to Taduchipa, "my daughter and thy wife," so that the relationship existing between the four can no longer admit of a doubt, unless Dushratta addressed the widowed queen *Tai* as "sister" in the same way that he addressed Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV as "brother," which is not at all likely. But it seems certain that Mitanni and *Naharuna* were convertible names, for the scarab mentioned shows that Sutarna, "king of *Naharuna*," sent his daughter Kiluchipa to Egypt, while Dushratta, "king of Mitanni," recognized Kiluchipa as his sister and Satarna as his father. The use of both names can be easily explained. *Naharuna* (*Na-aru-na*, *Na-iaru-na*) was the Egyptian name for the region inclosed by the rivers, and has come down to us, through the classics, in the Greek form Mesopotamia. Mitanni, or *Maten*, however, was the name of the country itself. Dushratta addresses Amenhotep IV as his "son-in-law," stating that their fathers had been in the closest alliance, that Amenhotep III had perfected the alliance, and had been in exceeding close alliance with Dushratta's father. "Now thou hast established it ten times more than in my father's time."

The meaning of this can not be mistaken. The "fathers" of both kings, referred to generally, were

Amenhotep II and Thothmes IV on the one hand, and Artatama and Sutarna on the other hand. We must not forget that Thothmes I, in the beginning of his reign, or about 1785 B. C., conquered Syria, invaded *Naharuna*, and commemorated his victories by a tablet set up on the eastern bank of the Euphrates; and that Thothmes III, in the thirty-third year of his reign, or about 1721 B. C., again penetrated to the same region, and set up a second tablet by the side of that set up by his grandfather. In his annals, Thothmes III informs us that, after the capture of Megiddo, in his twenty-third year, he "appointed chiefs anew" to rule over the land. In fact, the correspondence discovered at Tel-el-Amarna shows that he did this, as a rule, throughout Canaan and Syria. Thus, in his thirtieth year, Thothmes III tells us that he was in the land of the *Rutennu*, and spoiled Kadesh, and further, that the sons of the princes and their brothers were taken to Egypt as hostages, and that, if any of the chiefs died, his majesty would appoint his son in his place. The numerous petty chiefs, throughout the conquered region, were appointed by the king of Egypt from among these hostages, after they had been trained and educated in Egypt. We can now understand how the alliance between Egypt and Mitanni, which had been firmly cemented by the marriage of Artatama's daughter to Thothmes IV, was "perfected" by Amenhotep III. We know that Kiluchipa, the wife of Amenhotep III, was Dushratta's sister; but the relationship of *Tai*, or *Teie*, to the king of Mi-

tanni is not so easily explained, because she is called, upon an Egyptian inscription, the daughter of *Juia*, king of *Naharuna*, and *Tuia*, his wife. Dushratta obtained the crown after a struggle with Artash-shumara, his brother.

It seems that the latter induced the Hittites to espouse his cause, and brought them into the land of Mitanni; but they were defeated by Dushratta, who tells us that he slew Artash-shumara. Was *Tuia* the wife of Sutarna after the death of *Juia*?

When we consider that the royal houses of Egypt and Mitanni were united by marriage for nearly fifty years before the accession of Amenhotep IV, and that prior to and during this period, a large number of Asiatics were brought to Egypt and permanently domiciled there, we need not be surprised to find Asiatic ideas taking root at the court of Pharaoh, and the Government intrusted to Mesopotamians from the land of Mitanni.

An Egyptian vizier informs us that, under Amenhotep III, he filled the gaps in the ranks of the native citizens from among the best of the prisoners brought to Egypt from these regions.

The reign of *Ach-en-aten* marks the culmination of Mesopotamian influence in Egypt. The rightful name of this king was Amenhotep, but as his mother *Tai*, or *Teie*, was a foreigner, he was not eligible to the throne under the ancient laws of succession in Egypt. His father, however, who was the celebrated Memnon of the Greeks, openly defied the law by placing him on the throne, as co-regent, after he had

reigned thirty-one years and ten months. No one, it seems, dared to raise his voice against this innovation during the lifetime of the aged monarch, but, after his death, which occurred about four years later, loud and determined opposition grew up in Thebes, the beautiful capital of the South. The new king, with the impetuosity characteristic of youth and inexperience, endeavored to beat down all opposition by publically humiliating the proud and powerful priesthood of Thebes. He had retained the time-honored name of Amenhotep, and outwardly observed the worship of Amen (the tutelary deity of Thebes) during the lifetime of his father, but now, swayed by feelings of resentment and giving way to the influence of his Mesopotamian mother and wife, he boldly renounced the worship of Amen, and removed the capital to Tel-el-Amarna, which is about midway between Thebes and Memphis. He also changed his name to *Aten-ach-en-ra*, that is, "Aten, the splendor of Ra," and adopted the strange worship of Aten, or the "sun's disk," as Egyptologists have rendered it. We can not stop to inquire into the exact meaning of "*Aten*," which has been compared to the Syrian "Adon," or Lord, but will merely suggest to the reader that the sun of the Sothiac year, whose vicerent Pharaoh claimed to be, had set beneath the western horizon, and was so situated that the "splendor" of his disk could be seen with the naked eye. There are representations of this king holding aloft the three cartouches of "Horus on the horizon," to wit, "*Har-em-achu-ti, hai-em-ach-et, em ran-ef em Shu*,

*enti em Aten*," showing that he venerated Harmachis, or "Horus on the horizon," "in his name of *Shu*, which is the same as *Aten*." Thus *Aten* seems to represent the sun's force, as manifested in the effects of light, heat, etc. What the monuments have to say about *Aten* can be harmonized with *Shu*. We quote the following from Brugsch and Petrie:

"A royal offering to the living *Aten*, who enlightens the world by his benefactions," etc.

"Harmachu, by his name of *Shu*, who is *Aten* in Thebes," etc.

"Thy appearing in the horizon of heaven is beautiful,  
The living *Aten*, the beginning of life;  
Thou risest in the horizon of the east,  
Thou fillest every land with thy beauty,  
How many are the things which thou hast made!  
Thou createst the land by thy will; thou alone,  
With peoples, herds, and flocks,  
Everything on the face of the earth that walketh on its feet,  
Everything in the air that flieth with its wings," etc.

As beautiful and plausible as the above may seem at first blush, it ascribes to *Shu*, or *Aten*, what properly belongs to God, and, for this reason, the new doctrine was regarded by the learned priesthood of Thebes, and the "initiated" generally, as *rank heresy*, and was promptly repudiated as such.

It is at this time, and under these peculiar and abnormal circumstances, that the Tel-el-Armana clay-tablets reveal to us the presence at the Egyptian court of a Mesopotamian "Adon," bearing the name of Dudu or Tutu. The authority of this official, in the sight of men, was equal to that of Pharaoh himself, and we find that he is addressed by the same titles

of honor, except those which apply to the *person* of the king exclusively.

Thus Aziru, then governor of the land of *Amurri* (Amorrites), writing from Syria, addresses him thus: "To Dudu, my lord, my father; at the feet of my lord I prostrate myself." Dissensions at home had weakened the authority of the Egyptian Government in the provinces. The Hittites, who had been submissive under Thothmes III, had advanced from their Cappadocian fastnesses, and appeared before the city of *Tunep* (Tennib), northwest of Aleppo. Aziru writes: "The king of the land of the Hittites, O my lord, has marched into the country of Nuchassi, but has not prevailed over the cities. Now Chatib and I have marched in order to force him to withdraw. May the king, my lord, listen to my words. I am loyal, O my lord, to the king, my lord, *and to Dudu.*" He also writes: "From the commands of my lord, etc., and from the commands of Dudu, my lord, I do not free myself."

Aziru recognizes the authority of Dudu as equal to that of the king, and, in this respect, the *adon* Dudu resembles the *adon* Joseph. Pharaoh says to Joseph: "On the throne only will I be above thee." The sculptures and representations in the tombs of Tel-el-Amarna show the king attended by a grand vizier and escort, all of a foreign race. We now find that this high official bore the name of Dudu. The grand tomb of *Tutu*, at Tel-el-Amarna, with hall of twelve columns, scenes of King Achenaten, his queen, and three daughters, and long texts, had been visited

by Lepsius and described in the "Denkmäler," yet no one supposed that he had filled the important office of "*adon* over the whole land."

In Turin there is a group of sitting statues, in black granite, representing *Har-em-heb* and his queen. On the back of these is an inscription describing his career as an *adon*, which has been accurately translated by Brugsch. While yet a youth, he was presented to Pharaoh, and enraptured the heart of the king, who made him a *Ro-hir*, or Guardian, of the country. He administered this office to the entire satisfaction of the king and people of Egypt. He was next called to the court, where he advised the king with such wisdom and justice, that he was compared with Thoth and Ptah. "In all his deeds and ways he followed in their path, and they were his shield and protection on earth to all eternity."

In the course of time he was again promoted and raised to the office of *adon*, which position he held during a period of many years. The distinguished men at the court bowed themselves before him outside the door of the palace. "And when the kings of the nine foreign nations of the South and of the North appeared before him, they stretched out their hands at his approach, and praised his soul as if he had been God." Nothing was done except by his order. "Thus his authority was greater than that of the king in the sight of mortals, and all wished him prosperity and health." He punished the guilty and rewarded the deserving.

After this he was raised to the dignity of crown

prince, and finally became king. One might be tempted to believe that the writer of the beautiful story of Joseph had copied from the above inscription; but history repeated itself with remarkable regularity in ancient Egypt, and we can safely assume that the authority of Dudu as Adon was similar, in all respects, to that of *Har-em-hib*, for both were contemporaries.

It is probable that *Har-em-heb* was a son of Amenhotep III, succeeded Dudu, and was raised to the dignity of crown prince shortly before he became king.

There are many points of resemblance between Dudu and Joseph. Dudu was known as an adept in the science of divining. In Volume II, Records of the Past, page 67, there is a report addressed to the king of Egypt, in which Dudu's elevation to power is sarcastically ascribed to his skill in divining. The translation reads: "O father, thy father is not Aziru; he has not girdled the world with his governors and his prophesying."

Aziru was the governor of the land of Amurri, but it was Dudu who had appointed him, and who had "girdled the world with his governors and prophesying." Now Joseph says to his brethren: "Know ye not that there is no one like me in the science of divining?" It appears from Genesis, chapter 41, verses 41 to 43, that Pharaoh made Joseph ruler over all the land of Egypt; took off his ring from his own hand, and put it upon Joseph's hand; arrayed him in

the vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck, and made him ride in his second chariot; and that they cried before him, "Bow the knee."

In his latest work, entitled "The Egypt of the Hebrews and Herodotus," the eminent Assyriologist, Rev. A. H. Sayce, says:

"It is now more easy to explain the cry which was raised before Joseph when he went forth from the presence of Pharaoh with the golden chain around his neck and the royal signet upon his finger. '*Abrek!*' they shouted before him, and an explanation of the word has been vainly sought in the Egyptian language. It really is of Babylonian origin. In the primitive non-Semitic language of Chaldea *abrik* signified a 'seer' or 'soothsayer,' and the term was borrowed by the Semitic Babylonians under the two forms of *abrikku* and *abarakku*. Joseph was thus proclaimed a seer, and his exaltation was due to his power of foreseeing the future. It was as a divinely-inspired seer that the subjects of the Pharaoh were to reverence him. How a Babylonian word like *abrek* came to be used in Egypt it is idle for us to inquire," etc.

Thus "bow the knee" is not the correct translation of the Cushite word *abrek*, and is no better than the translation of the Egyptian word *ab*, "councillor," which now appears as "father."

We have just seen that Dudu's accession to power was attributed to his mastery of the science of divining, and this was the reason the crier, who went in front of his chariot, shouted "*abrek*," that is (as we should say), "make way for the seer!"

The use of the Cushite word "*abrek*" is just what we might expect under the circumstances. During the five hundred and eleven years of Hamite domination over Egypt, the Egyptians had abundant opportunity to become acquainted with the language and peculiar system of writing of the invaders. This so-called "primitive non-Semitic language" became the literary language of Western Asia, and bore about the same relation to later Semitic languages that Latin does to modern English.

We have seen how the purely Hamitic title Nebroth, "Pursuer," came to be applied to *Aahmes*, under the form of "Chnebros."

Such variations as Niprut, Nebroth, and Nimrod are analogous to *Neb-muat-ra* "Nim-mut-ria," and "Nim-mu-ria."

Speaking from the contemporary monuments, the last eighty years of Joseph's life coincide with the period of Asiatic predominance at the Egyptian court, which came to an end at the accession of Horus, or *Har-em-heb*; therefore, the *adon Har-em-heb* could not have been the *adon* Joseph. The only *adon* who answers to the Biblical Joseph is Dudu, or *Tutu*. If the story of Joseph is to be taken literally, we must place his accession about fifteen years before the death of Thothmes III; and the seven years of scarcity, or deficient overflow of the Nile, would end about the same time, to wit, 1700 B. C.; but if, like the story of the Flood, it is allegorical, the career of the Mesopotamian Dudu would answer every purpose. I regard the story as an allegory, because the name

Joseph is a tribe-name, and the monuments of the time of Thothmes III and Amenhotep II bear no evidence of an *adon* corresponding to Joseph, or bearing any name or title resembling his. I do not mean to assert that such evidence may not be discovered at some future time, but merely that it has not been up to this date.

We have seen from the inscription of the ship-captain *Aahmes*, son of Baba, that *Aahmes*, the king, in the sixth year of his reign, besieged the fortress of Sheruhen, in southern Palestine, near Gaza, and took it. This placed in the hands of the Egyptian army the key to the great military and commercial road leading northwardly along the seacoast to Syria. The same warrior tells us that after Thothmes I had quelled the rebellion in Nubia, he betook himself to the land of the *Rutennu* (Syria) to slake his anger among the inhabitants of the land; that His Majesty reached the land of *Naharuna*, and found the enemies who had plotted conspiracy; that His Majesty engaged them in battle, made a great slaughter of them, and carried away an immense number of living captives after his victory. *Aahmes* tells us that he was at the head of the warriors, and that Thothmes I admired his valor, etc.

*Aahmes*, surnamed *Pen-nucheb*, a contemporary of the ship-captain *Aahmes*, tells us that he served the king Thothmes I, accompanied him on the campaign to Nubia, and took for him, in the land of *Naharuna*, twenty-one hands, a horse, and a war-chariot.

Neither one of these warriors mentions any battles,

or siege, along the entire route, many hundreds of miles in length, from Egypt to Aram-Naharain, which indicates that Canaan and Syria, along the great highway mentioned, were already in the possession of the Egyptians. We learn from an impartial and unbiased source that, as early as the beginning of the reign of Thothmes I, or about 1784 B. C., immense numbers of Mesopotamians, from the region then inhabited by Israel and his sons, were carried away to Egypt as living captives. Many inhabitants of this region were carried away to Egypt during the long reign of Thothmes III, and were forced to labor upon public works. Thus there was abundant material in Egypt from which the coming nation of Israel could recruit its numbers, and we need not wonder that it multiplied so rapidly. *Het-shepsut*, or Mephres, the mother of Thothmes III, regarded the foreigners favorably, as she herself assures us, and by the end of the reign of Amenhotep III they were freely admitted into Egypt, and even naturalized as citizens. The Mitannian escort, which entered Egypt with Taduchipa, was placed among the houses which Amenhotep III gave to her. The Mitannian ambassador Gillya, who accompanied her, was honored by the Egyptian king, and placed in the front rank. Gold by the thousand-weight was showered on Taduchipa, and she gave Gillya whatever he desired. Amenhotep did this on account of his friendship for Dush-ratta and love for Teie. After the death of the Egyptian king, Teie, on behalf of her son Amenhotep IV,

offered Dushratta an alliance and brotherhood. The latter writes:

"Now they say that Nimmuriya (Amenhotep III) has died, and what they have said has distracted my heart. I wept on that day, and on my throne I did not sit. Bread and water on that day I did not take, and I was sad.

"Now the eldest son of Nimmuriya by Teie, his wife, has offered me alliance and brotherhood, speaking thus: 'Nimmuriya is not dead, since Amenophis IV, his eldest son by Teie, his chief wife, sits in his place, for he will never alter his words, but they shall remain as before.' "

In another letter to Amenophis IV, after greeting Teie, his mother, and Taduchipa, his wife, Dushratta writes:


"And as regards the frequent intercourse which I had with thy father, Teie, thy mother, knows the facts; but after Teie, thy mother, *thou* knowest them, and what he said to thee. As thy father was friendly with me, so art thou. O my brother, again friendly with me, and what is contrary thereto no one listens to."

It is evident that a perfect understanding existed between Amenhotep III and the Mitannian king, and that Teie alone was taken into their confidence. Amenhotep IV was also initiated into the strange league, and Teie had formed such a correct estimate of his character, disposition, and aims, that she did not hesitate to give Dushratta the most positive assurances as to his future conduct as king. The ex-

cellent portraits of Teie which have come down to us show that she was a woman of rare intellectuality and beauty; her complexion, unlike that of the native Egyptian women, was light and somewhat rosy, her forehead high, and full in the regions of individuality, causality, and comparison, and her features delicate, refined, and remarkably attractive. For over forty years, during the reigns of Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV, her influence was potent in molding the Egyptian Government according to her own peculiar political and religious notions. Is it a wonder then that, under the sole reign of Amenhotep IV, or "Achenres," we find, besides *Taia* and *Taiti*, a Mesopotamian *adon*, court, and body-guard, and the Mesopotamian worship of *Aten*? In many respects Teie reminds us of the Mesopotamian Rachel, who stole her father's idols, and carried them off to Canaan.

"Achenres" constructed a remarkable temple, of beautiful and unique workmanship, at Tel-el-Amarna, which he dedicated to Aten; and in his sixth year that is, second year of his sole reign, his mother, Queen Teie, appeared as the central figure in the ceremonies and festivities of the occasion.

The children of Israel had been dwelling in Egypt about fifty-three years at this time, and, although the Mesopotamian *adon* Dudu is not specially mentioned in the representations of this important event, it is almost certain that this high official, who was more powerful in the sight of mortals than Pharaoh himself, was present. The fact that Joseph's death



is fixed at about 1634 B. C., does not conflict with the fact that Dudu's tomb is just back of Tel-el-Amarna, for it was constructed in the lifetime of the *adon*, and during the reign of *Ach-en-aten*.

### **"THE PHARAOH OF THE OPPRESSION"**

We have just seen that the one hundred and ten years assigned to Joseph in Bible chronology, and the eighty years of Mesopotamian influence at the Egyptian court, came to an end at the accession of *Har-em-heb*, or Horus, as king, to wit, about 1634 B. C.

The book of Exodus introduces us to a new period. "And Joseph died, and all his brethren, and all that generation." The original Mesopotamian settlers had passed away, and their descendants, born and reared in Egypt, began to fill the land of Goshen. "And the children of Israel were fruitful, and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and waxed exceeding mighty; and the land [Goshen] was filled with them. Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph." This "new king" was apprehensive that, in case war should break out, the Israelites might join his enemies, and fight against the Egyptians. "and so get them up out of the land;" and therefore set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens; and they built for Pharaoh temple-cities, Pithom and Raamses. This name Ramesses which certainly could not have been given before the accession of Ramesses I, is of controlling importance in determining the name and date of the

“new king” referred to. We have already seen that, owing to the long “joint-reign” of father and son, it is, and always was, very difficult to separate the reigns of Ramesses I, Seti I, and Ramesses II, which, together, cover the phenomenal period of one hundred and twenty-seven years.

Although Ramesses I was, strictly speaking, the “new king,” who knew not Joseph, that is, the Mesopotamian influence at the Egyptian court (for Horus had abolished it), he reigned but one year and four months before his infant son, Seti I, was crowned as joint-king. There are many facts going to show that Ramesses I, contrary to the general opinion, enjoyed a comparatively long reign, but it was completely eclipsed and obscured by the remarkable genius and glorious achievements of his son, co-regent and successor, the legendary Sesostris. Again, the long reign of Ramesses II was preceded by his joint-reign with his father, Seti I. Thus it is evident that the three reigns overlapped in a confusing and perplexing manner, and we must not forget that the “Oppression,” which commenced under the joint-reign of Ramesses I and Seti I, continued many, many years. According to the Bible narrative, which is brief and fragmentary, “the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew.” It necessarily required years of affliction to make this experience, and it was not until after this that Pharaoh charged the people to cast every male child that was born into the river.

Happily we are in a position to fix the Bible date

of this inhuman edict. It was in force when Moses was born, eighty years before the Exodus, that is, about 1571 B. C., but did not affect Aaron, who was born three years before that date. Thus Seti I was the Pharaoh who devised this cruel means of preventing the Hebrews from multiplying, after they had been systematically afflicted for nearly fifty years. About this time Seti caused his son Ramesses II, then a child about twelve years old, to be publicly crowned as joint-regent. Ramesses, therefore, was about twelve years older than Moses, and the "daughter of Pharaoh" who adopted the Hebrew waif as her son was a sister to Ramesses. The king who first commanded the Hebrew midwives to kill all the male children, and afterwards charged the people to drown every male child born to the Hebrew women, must have been possessed of a cruel and arbitrary disposition. Now, what do the monuments teach us as to the character of Seti?

The inscriptions at Karnak tell us, concerning this, that "his joy is to undertake the battle, and his delight is to dash into it. His heart is only satisfied at the sight of the streams of blood when he strikes off the heads of his enemies. A moment of the struggle of men is dearer to him than a day of pleasure. He slays them with one stroke, and spares none among them. And whoever of them is left remaining finds himself in his grasp, and is carried off to Egypt alive as a prisoner." This contemporary picture of the great Sesostris, in the first year of his sole-reign, accords well with the character of the

king who attempted to check the rapid increase of the Israelites in Goshen by killing off the male children at birth. Such cruelty is unusual in an Egyptian Pharaoh; but Ramesses I seems to have been devoted to *Set*, or Sutech, the divinity of the serpent-worshipping Hyksos, and his son *Seti*, who was named in honor of *Set*, openly emulated the fierce and cruel virtues of the foreign deity, the *Apap* or *Set-an* of the Egyptians. The first campaign undertaken by *Seti*, in the first year of his sole reign, happened to be against the hostile *Shasu*, or Beduin, of southern Canaan. The Hebrews claimed to be related to these *Shasu* through their forefather Abram, and the cruelty and severity of *Seti*'s measures may have been owing to this fact. It seems that Syria and a part of Canaan were lost to Egypt during the weak reign of Achenaten's daughter, for the *Cheta*, or Hittites, who were seated north of Aleppo, in the Cappadocian fastnesses, at the beginning of Achenaten's reign were firmly established in the city of Kadesh on the Orontes when *Seti* began to reign. A formidable enemy to the Egyptian Government had suddenly arisen in the great people of *Cheta*. This critical state of affairs in the provinces induced the king of Egypt to make the city of Tanis (Zoan) his principal place of residence. This city commanded the approach to the great military road leading along the coast of the Mediterranean Sea to Canaan and Syria, and was the natural base of operations for campaigns against these countries.

Brugsch-Bey, the best authority on all matters

relating to the geography of ancient Egypt, identifies the temple-city of Ramesses with Tanis; that is, he identifies the *new* and beautiful city of Ramesses, where Ramesses II delighted to hold his court, with the sacred quarter of Tanis.

Now the temple-cities of Pithom (Patumos, *Per-tum*) and Raamses (Ramesses), which the unfortunate Hebrews were forced to build for Pharaoh, were certainly in, or near, the land of Goshen.

We have no right to assume that there were two important cities named Ramesses in the same district at this time, unless we are forced to do so by direct and incontrovertible evidence. A critical examination of the Bible narrative with reference to the location of Ramesses, will render it reasonably certain that it was the celebrated temple-city, or sacred quarter, of Tanis, in the plain of Zoan, which was named after Ramesses I. At the time of the Exodus, Menophthah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus, was in this city of Ramesses, and the Hebrews, who had been gathered together by their elders, under the direction of Aaron and Moses, were encamped under its walls. The Bible narrative admits of no other construction. We are told that "only in the land of Goshen *where the children of Israel were*, there was no hail." (Exodus ix, 26.)

Moses would leave his people, go into the city where Pharaoh was, stand before him, and demand their release, and then come out of the city from Pharaoh. "And Moses said unto him [Pharaoh]: As soon as I am gone out of the city, I will spread

abroad my hands unto the Lord," etc. "And Moses went out of the city from Pharaoh, and spread abroad his hands," etc. (Exodus ix, 29, 33.)

When the first-born were smitten at midnight, we are told that Pharaoh rose up in the night, and he called for Moses and Aaron by night, showing that they were near at hand, and that the scene of the terrible tragedy was in and before the city of Ramesses, where Menophthah then held his court.

The journey of the Israelites began at this city. "And the children of Israel journeyed from Ramesses to Succoth." (Exodus xii, 37.)

The first day's journey, therefore, was from Ramesses, that is, the sacred, or temple, quarter of Tanis, to Succoth, which was but another name for Pithom. Ramesses and Pithom were the sacred, or temple, names of Zoan and Succoth.

Now turn to Brugsch's translation of the inscription relating to the treaty between Ramesses II and *Cheta-sar*, dated in the year 21, on the 21st day of Tybi. We read: "On that day the king was in the city of Ramesses, presenting his peace-offerings to his father *Amen-ra*," etc. Among the so-called gods mentioned who had temples, or tabernacles, in this city, were *Har-em-achu Tum*, lord of Heliopolis, *Amen*, *Ptah*, and *Sutech*, or *Set*.

The "river" mentioned in Exodus i, 22, was the Pelusiac arm of the Nile, which then flowed through and watered the land of Goshen. The city of Ramesses, named after Ramesses I, who, no doubt,

made it his residence, was situated on this so-called "river."

The child Moses was placed in the flags, or bul-rushes, by this river's brink. The daughter of Pharaoh came down to wash herself at this river, and, walking along the river's side with her maidens, saw the ark among the flags.

As Moses was grown when he slew the Egyptian (Exodus ii, 11), we must place this event in the sole reign of Ramesses II. Now Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh, and dwelt in the land of Midian, until, "in the process of time," it came to pass that the king of Egypt died. Thus Moses was absent from Egypt for at least fifty years, which accounts for the fact that all the men were dead which sought his life. (Exodus iv, 19.)

Ramesses II, as joint-king with *Seti*, and afterwards during the sixty-six years of his sole reign, continued to afflict the Israelites with heavy burdens, for "all their service, wherein they made them serve, was with rigor." We are told that they sighed by reason of their bondage. Taskmasters and officers were placed over them, who hastened them, saying, "Fulfill your works, your daily tasks." Thus it appears that the Israelites who were invited to settle in Egypt were, in the course of time, treated like prisoners of war. There is a pictorial representation on the walls of a tomb at Abd-el-Qurnah, of the time of Thothmes III, showing the severe labor to which the captive countrymen of Israel and his sons were

subjected. Some of them fetch water from the pond hard by; others knead the earth; others mold the bricks, and place them in rows to dry; and others again are employed upon the building. The inscription tells us they are captives carried away by Thothmes III; "they work at the building with dexterous fingers; their overseers show themselves in sight; these attend in *strictness*, obeying the words of the great, skillful lord, who gives directions to the masters. They are rewarded with wine and all kinds of good dishes; they perform their service with a mind full of love for the king. The overseer speaks thus to the laborers at the building: '*The stick is in my hand, be not idle.*' "

Of course, these were not the same Hebrews mentioned in Holy Scriptures, but the representation and inscription relating to similar work at Thebes may serve to illustrate the hard fate of the Israelites, who were forced to work on the storehouses and temples erected by Ramesses I, Seti I, and Ramesses II in the new and beautiful capital of the Delta, the famous city of Ramesses. The parallel is perfect even down to the palatable and nourishing food furnished to the workmen. No doubt the Hebrews were likewise rewarded for their excellent service with wine and all kinds of good dishes; for when they were restricted to the meager diet of the desert they often wished themselves back to the tempting flesh-pots of Egypt.

In the so-called "Letter of Panbesa" we have an excellent description of the city of Ramesses, written by an eye-witness. He tells us that nothing on

Theban soil could compare with it. Its canals were rich in fish, its lakes swarmed with birds, its meadows were green with vegetables; there was no end of lentils, and melons with a taste like honey grew in the irrigated fields. Its barns were full of wheat and durra, and reached as high as heaven.

The apple-tree, almond-tree, fig-tree, and vine grew in the gardens. All kinds of fish abounded. Ships sailed up from the sea and entered the harbor, bringing all kinds of foreign delicacies and luxuries. Plenty and abundance prevailed in the city. It was pleasant to live in. He who settled there rejoiced. The youths were perpetually clad in festive attire. The hero who was then celebrated in this wonderful city was Ramesses II, the son of Seti. It was the royal residence (*chinnu*). We accordingly find Ramesses in his first year—that is, shortly after the death of Seti—"on his first journey to Thebes." When he returned from the capital of the "land of the south," the order was given for the journey down the stream to the city of Ramesses.

Thus the "oppression" continued with ever-increasing vigor for nearly one hundred and thirty years, and affected four successive generations of the Hebrews. In some respects it proved beneficial to them, for it transformed tribes of migratory *Shasu*, depending altogether upon their herds and flocks for subsistence, into a nation of "settled people," accustomed to manual work and prepared to till the soil and earn a living in their prospective home in Canaan.

## THE PHARAOH OF THE EXODUS

The epoch-reign of Seti I, to wit, "Osiropis," or *Hus-ir-api*, with twenty-three years, which has been fully examined in other chapters of this work, fixes the death of Sesostris (Sethos, Sethosis) at 1621 B. C. This date, therefore, can be accepted as absolute. Although Seti I caused his son Ramesses to be exhibited to the people as crown prince and joint-regent when he was but a youth, he did not permit him to exercise the authority of Pharaoh, or to date monuments in his own name during his lifetime. Ramesses tells us in one place that he was raised to be a *Ro-hir* of the land when he counted ten full years, and in another place that he was a little boy before he attained to the government, and that his father showed him publicly to the people when he was a boy and caused him to be crowned as king, so that he might behold his excellence while he was yet alive. While this may be true, it is certain, from the inscriptions themselves, that the first year of the reign of Ramesses II dates from the death of his father, and not from the beginning of the joint-reign.

It has become the fashion to regard Ramesses II as the "Pharaoh of the Oppression"—that is, as the king who issued the edict to drown the Hebrew children in the river—and, gauging his character according to such deeds, to portray him as a cruel and inhuman monster. But the contemporary monuments, which are plentiful, show conclusively that this *a priori* assumption is false and unfounded. At the

beginning of his reign he was actuated by feelings of intense filial piety. He next appears as a brave and chivalrous leader upon the field of battle. As a builder in completing the marvelously beautiful monuments designed and begun by his father, and in erecting others equally grand and unique all over Egypt, from Tanis to the southern boundary of Nubia, his activity stands unrivaled. It is true the monuments and inscriptions bear witness to his overweening pride and vanity, but they nowhere reveal any trait of cruelty or inhumanity such as that just described in Seti's character. In fact, the Bible narrative fails to mention any special act of cruelty during the long reign of Ramesses II. When he became king, the policy of Seti I, respecting the treatment and management of the Hebrews, had ripened into a settled custom. Ramesses simply continued this settled policy, and compelled the Hebrews to work upon the temples and buildings erected by him in the district of Goshen, and particularly in the temple quarter of Tanis, known as the city of Ramesses, his new and splendid capital.

Shortly after Ramesses became celebrated and renowned as the "Hero of Kadesh," Moses had the misfortune to slay an Egyptian, and fled to the land of Midian to escape punishment. We are told that it came to pass in those days "when Moses was grown," that he went unto his brethren and looked on their burdens, and he spied an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew, etc. This was certainly eleven, and probably not more than twenty, years after Ramesses began to

reign as sole king, and agrees with the presence of the court and "Pharaoh's Daughter" at the city of Ramesses.

Now, imagine the children of Israel in bondage, driven on and afflicted by taskmasters, and sighing and crying by reason thereof for sixty-six years and two months from the accession as sole-king to the death of Ramesses II, and you will be better able to appreciate the weight and importance of the words, "And it came to pass *after a long time* [or, as some have rendered it, 'in the process of time'], that the king of Egypt died." When this happened the twelve eldest sons of the king, including *Cha-em-uas*, who had been on the throne as joint-king, had passed to their eternal rest, and Fate decreed that *Mer-nuptah*, or Menophthah, should become the successor of the celebrated "Son of Sethos," and pose before the world as the "Pharaoh of the Exodus." Menophthah was well advanced in years when the high office was unexpectedly thrust upon him, and he was but poorly prepared to assume the grave responsibilities attached to it. He did not inherit the towering form, majestic features, and commanding presence of his father; neither did nature endow him with the bright intellect, quick perception, and ready determination of Ramesses. Instead of the broad and liberal religious views of his father, he seems to have been bigoted, narrow-minded, and superstitious. His character was of an anomalous kind, weak and vacillating at one time, stubborn and unrelenting at another.

In the fifth year of this king's reign—that is, in



1491 B. C., the year of the Exodus—Egypt was confronted by a sudden and unexpected danger, as we learn from an important inscription which he “caused to be chiseled on the inner side-wall of one of the southern fore-courts of the great temple of *Amen* at Thebes.”

The Libyans and their mercenaries, the Mediterranean *Shardena* (Sardinians), *Shekel-sha* (Sicilian rovers), *A-ka-ua-sha* (Achaian rovers), *Liku* (Lycians), *Tur-sha*, etc., “peoples of the north,” invaded Egypt, and plundered the land. Menophthah equipped the choicest of his mercenaries, and assembled his chariots from all directions. “His life-guards marched forward,” the most powerful of his warriors came on, and the entrance of his mercenaries is said to have been a beautiful sight for the inhabitants of Egypt. We are informed that the king spoke to the leaders of the host, who stood before him, that they should destroy the people of the *Libu* (Libyans). “They went forth, and the hand of God was with them. Amen was at their side as a shield.” The news was spread abroad that the king *in person* would take part in the campaign on the 14th day of Payni. But, if we understand the text, which is injured and mutilated in part—often in the most important places—as interpreted by Brugsch, whom I have followed above, a timely vision served as a convenient pretext for remaining behind within the walls of Memphis. “Then his majesty beheld in a dream as if the image of Ptah, which is placed at the (gate of the temple), stepped down to Pharaoh. It was like a giant. (And it was)

as if it spoke to him, 'Remain altogether behind;' and, handing to him the battle-sword, 'Mayest thou cast off the lazy disposition that is in thee!'

Although the vision ironically echoed Menophthah's fervent wish to "remain behind," it really admonished him to lay aside the cowardly disposition that was in him, and to use the battle-sword that was handed to him in defense of his country; but he construed it as a Divine admonition to remain in Memphis, and accordingly sent forth the army under the leaders of the mercenaries. Fortunately, victory crowned the banners of the Egyptians, and we read of the triumphal return of the "leaders of the foreign mercenaries, the life-guards, the chariots of war, and all the warriors of the army, whose service was ended."

These were, no doubt, the same chariots of war which pursued the fleeing Israelites to *Pi-hahiroth*, between Migdol and the sea, before Baal-Zephon. Pharaoh made ready his chariot, "and he took six hundred chosen chariots and all the chariots of Egypt, and captains over every one of them."

But we merely wanted to illustrate Menophthah's weak and vacillating character and his superstitious turn of mind, from the contemporary inscription chiseled on the walls of the great Temple of Karnak by his own order.

Manetho's description of this Pharaoh, judging from the confused and jumbled extracts from his history quoted at random by Josephus, agrees with the above in every particular. He tells us that Menophthah (rendered Amenophath, Amenophthis, Ameno-

phis, etc., by mistake) "was desirous to become a spectator of the gods," as had Horus, one of his predecessors in the kingdom, desired the same before him; that he communicated this desire to his namesake, Menophthah, the son of Papis, who "seemed to partake of a divine nature, both as to wisdom and the knowledge of futurities;" that "this namesake of his told him that he might see the gods if he would clear the whole country of the lepers and of the other impure people;" and that the king was pleased with the injunction, and got together all that had any defect in their bodies out of Egypt, "eighty thousand in number, whom he sent to those quarries which are on the east side of the Nile, that they might work in them, and be separated from the rest of the Egyptians."

So much for Menophthah's superstitious turn of mind. Now, as to the weak and vacillating traits of his character. "After those that were sent to the quarries had continued in that miserable state for a long while, the king was desired that he would set apart the city of Avaris, which was then left desolate of the shepherds, for their habitation and protection, which desire he granted them." This proves that he completely reversed his original policy within less than seven years, for the ignominious flight to Ethiopia took place in the eighth year of his reign.

When the lepers and impure people, who had in the meantime fortified Avaris by building new walls around it, had risen in open revolt, and had been joined by the shepherds from Jerusalem—that is, the

Canaanite descendants of the 'Aamu driven out of Egypt by Amosis—Menophthah, the king of Egypt, was in great confusion; and in the first place assembled the multitude of the Egyptians, and took counsel with their leaders, and sent for their sacred animals to him, especially for those that were principally worshiped in the temples, and gave a particular charge to the priests distinctly, that they should hide the images of their gods with the utmost care. He also sent his son, Sethos (*Seti II, Mer-nu-ptah*), who was also named Ramesses from his father, Rhampses, being but five years old, to a friend of his. He then passed on with the rest of the Egyptians, being three hundred thousand of the most warlike of them, against the enemy, who met them. Yet he did not join battle with them; but thinking that would be to fight against the gods, he returned back and came to Memphis, where he took Apis and the other sacred animals which he had sent for to him, and presently marched into Ethiopia, together with his whole army and multitude of Egyptians; for the King of Ethiopia was under an obligation to him, on which account he received him and took care of all the multitude that was with him, while the country supplied all that was necessary for the food of the men. He also allotted cities and villages for this exile, that was to be from its beginning during those fatally determined thirteen years. Moreover, he pitched a camp for his Ethiopian army, as a guard to King Menophthah, upon the borders of Egypt. And this was the state of things in Ethiopia."

---

Now, when we bear in mind that the lepers and impure people numbered but eighty thousand and the shepherds two hundred thousand all told, and Menophthah's army consisted of three hundred thousand men "of the most warlike of them," we must confess that his conduct on this occasion was the most shameful and pusillanimous to be found in the annals of Egyptian history. The king, who publicly boasted that "he was crowned to preserve life to mortals;" that "he was brought in as king to protect men;" that "there was strength in him to do this, because he was the likeness of the beautiful faced Ptah;" and that "he was a hero, who took no count of hundreds of thousands on the day of the turmoil of battle," marches forth with three hundred thousand of the most warlike of the Egyptians, including the veterans who had overthrown the Libyans and their European allies, arrives in sight of the enemy, his inferior in numbers, organization, and discipline, and then turns his back and leaves his country to its fate—its cities, towns, and inhabitants a helpless prey in the clutches of a cruel and barbarous foe. Manetho assures us that the Canaanites, when they came down together with the polluted Egyptians, treated the Egyptians in the most barbarous manner, and were guilty of horrid wickedness: for they set the cities and villages on fire, destroyed the images of the gods, forced the priests and prophets to be the executioners of the sacred animals, and then ejected them naked out of the country.

This much, however, must be said in extenuation

of Menophthah's extraordinary conduct. Following the sure guidance of the astronomical numbers, checked by the four Sothiac months (four hundred and eighty years) between the Exodus and the Building of the Temple, the Invasion of the Canaanites and the Flight to Ethiopia took place about three years after the Exodus, and Menophthah may have been laboring under the effects of the terrifying events which preceded and accompanied the departure of the Israelites from Egypt.

We have already seen that a Sothiac festival, known as a "*hib-sed*," was celebrated in the second year of this Pharaoh's reign—that is, in the year 1494 B. C., or ninety years ( $30 \times 3$ ) after the Sothiac epoch of Epiphi, 1584 B. C. As Menophthah mounted the throne in 1495 B. C. (add epoch-reign of Seti I, to wit, twenty-three years, to the sixty-six years and two months of Ramesses II), the celebration of this festival "on time," in the second year of his reign, is a most remarkable and fortuitous coincidence. The Exodus occurred on the 15th day of Epiphi (*Apapi*) in the fifth year of Menophthah's reign, 1491 B. C. "This day came ye out in the month of Abib." (Exodus xiii, 4.) Now, as the defeat of the Libyans and their European allies took place on the 3d of Epiphi, in the same year, the Exodus may have been closely connected with the invasion of these foreigners.

Although there are several suspicious-looking blanks in the great inscription of Menophthah, where, from the context, we might expect to find the name of

the Hebrews, or Israelites, several portions of it, in my opinion, referred to their revolt and preparations to leave the land. Lines 7, 8, and 9 read as follows, with hypothetical restorations of Brugsch:

“(For the foreign peoples (?) had long since made inroads from the east, and had pitched) their tents before the town of Pi-bailos (Byblus, Bilbeis); they found themselves on the canal *Sha-ka-na*, to the north of the canal *Ôa* (of Heliopolis), (so that the adjoining land) was not cultivated, but was left as pasture for cattle on account of the foreigners. *It lay waste there from the times of our forefathers.* All the rulers (*ur-u*) of Upper Egypt sat in their intrenchments, . . . and the rulers (*ur-u*) of Lower Egypt found themselves in the midst of their cities, surrounded with earthworks, cut off from everything by warriors, for they had no mercenaries to oppose to them. Thus had it been (until the day when King Menophthah) ascended the throne of Horus.”

The above can not refer to the invasion of the Libyans under their king, “Marjui,” because it took place in the fifth year of Menophthah’s reign. The “foreign people” (*Peti-shu?*) here alluded to were the Hebrews, who had been taken from their work and gathered together by their “elders,” under the direction of Aaron and Moses, and it seems that they had pitched their tents before the town of Bilbeis, which was not far from Bubastis. This position commanded the approach to the Wady Tumilat and the important canal by which it was watered, and constituted an excellent base from which the Hebrews might co-oper-

ate with the army of the Libyans, which was approaching from the west. The statement that the district was not cultivated, but was "left as pasture for cattle on account of the foreigners," could not apply to the Libyans, because it had lain thus from the times of his forefathers. The "land of Goshen," however, had been used by the Hebrews as pasture for two hundred and fifteen years. The concluding sentence, therefore, should be restored, as follows, "Thus had it been since the day when King Menophthah ascended the throne of Horus."

De Rougè, I believe, was the first to show that the Exodus occurred shortly after the death of Ramesses II, and not at the *end* of Menophthah's reign; and, furthermore, that as Moses was eighty years old when he and Aaron stood before Pharaoh, and one hundred and twenty years old when he died, the "forty years in the wilderness" leave but one year for the successive plagues.

We must bear in mind that Aaron, *not Moses*, appeared as the head and front of the movement in Egypt. We are told: "And the Lord said to Aaron, Go into the wilderness to meet Moses. And he went, and met him in the mount of God, and kissed him." "And Moses and Aaron went and gathered together all the elders of the children of Israel: and Aaron spake all the words which the Lord had spoken to Moses."

Several separate and distinct accounts of the Exodus have been patched together in the present book of Exodus, so that this fact is stated several times.

Aaron is the spokesman of Moses unto the people. Moses says: "Behold, the children of Israel have not hearkened unto me; how then shall Pharaoh hear me, who am of uncircumcised lips?" Again we read: "And Moses said before the Lord, Behold, I am of uncircumcised lips, and how shall Pharaoh hearken unto me? And the Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a god (?) to Pharaoh; and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet. Thou shalt speak all that I command thee; and Aaron thy brother shall speak unto Pharaoh," etc.

Moses had been absent from Egypt for more than fifty years; but Aaron the *Levite* had lived there for eighty-three years; and, although we are ignorant of the history of his long and eventful life prior to the year 1491 B. C., we can safely assume that he held a high and influential position among his countrymen.

According to the extract of Josephus, Manetho referred to him as follows: "It was also reported that the priest who ordained their polity and their laws was by birth of Heliopolis; and his name Osarsiph, from Osiris, who was the god of Heliopolis; but that when he was gone over to these people his name was changed, and he was called Moses."

Josephus adds to this and foregoing extracts: "This is what the Egyptians relate about the Jews, *with much more*, which I omit for the sake of brevity." By "Jews" he means the Israelites, of course, and not the one tribe only.

After explaining that Avaris, which had been al-

lotted to the lepers and impure people, was, according to the ancient theology, Typhon's city, Manetho continues, as follows:

“But when these men were gotten into it, and found the place fit for a revolt, they appointed themselves a ruler out of the priests of Heliopolis, whose name was Osarsiph, and they took their oath that they would be obedient to him in all things. He then, in the first place, made this law for them, that they should neither worship the Egyptian gods nor should abstain from any of those sacred animals which they have in the highest esteem, but kill and destroy them all; that they should join themselves to nobody but that were of this confederacy. When he had made such laws as these, and many more such as were mainly opposite to the customs of the Egyptians, he gave order that they should employ the multitude of the hands they had in building walls about their city, and make themselves ready for a war with King Menophthah, while he did himself take into his friendship the other priests and those that were polluted with them, and sent ambassadors to those shepherds who had been driven out of the land by Tethmosis to the city called Jerusalem; whereby he informed them of his own affairs, and of the state of those others who had been treated after such an ignominious manner, and desired that they should come with one consent to his assistance in this war against Egypt. He also promised that he would, in the first place, bring them back to their ancient city and country Avaris, and provide a plentiful maintenance for their multitude; that he would protect them and fight for them as occasion should require, and would easily reduce the country under their dominion.”

We here break off the quotation, to remind the reader that the term "impure people" was often used to designate foreigners who did not observe the religion or customs of the Egyptians. The Hebrews, therefore, may have been referred to in this account as "impure people." But how can we possibly identify Osarsiph, or Arsiph, a priest of Heliopolis, with Aaron the Levite? In the first place, it is evident that Aaron and Moses were confounded and regarded as one person. We are dealing with the Egyptian account, in which the name Aaron certainly appeared in somewhat different form. In the Harris papyrus we find that a Canaanite, named *Ar-su* (*Ar-suf?*), raised himself up to be a prince, and compelled all the people to pay him tribute.

Now, we must not forget that Joseph was married to Aseneth, the daughter of Putiphero, priest of Heliopolis, showing the connection of the Israelites with this city from the earliest times. Even after the Exodus, in the times of Ramesses III and Ramesses IV, we still find *Eber-i-u* dwelling as "settled people" in Heliopolis. But is it at all strange that Arsiph, Os-ar-siph, or Aaron should appear as a priest of Heliopolis? Several stelæ at West Silsilis, dating from the beginning of Menophthah's reign, show this king followed by the high priest of Amen, named *Rui*, or *Lui*. Now, what is *Lui* but Louis, Levi, etc.? This name *Lui*, or Levi, is directly connected with the priestly function, so that "Aaron the Levite" is equivalent to Aaron the priest. We must remember that

the Bible tells us absolutely nothing about the history of Aaron previous to his connection with the Exodus; but we are bound to assume that he was a priest, thoroughly educated in the various branches of theology and trained in the complicated ritual and ceremonial of the office.

A few months after the Exodus, Aaron and his sons, Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar, were set apart for the priest's office. (Exodus xxviii, 1.) The daughter of Seti, who adopted Moses and had him brought up with so much care, no doubt arranged to have his brother Aaron provided with the "next best office to prince," namely, *high priest*. Thus Moses, the son of Pharaoh's daughter, naturally takes the place of Pharaoh, while Aaron takes that of high priest. We have seen how the name of Joseph (*Ia-saf*) was "turned" to Safnath-pa-an-eah (*Saf-na-ta-pa-anech*), in which the element *sa-f*, or "saviour," was retained. In the case of Aaron, the element "*ar*" seems to have been retained. The name Osiris resolves itself into *Hus-ar*, or *Hus-ir*, meaning "the house or abode of the eye." In this name, *Hus-ar*, "*ar*," or "eye"—that is, Ra in his capacity of right eye—is undoubtedly the main element, and the only one that could be used in "turning" the name of Aaron. When Manetho, the learned priest, says that the priest of Heliopolis, who ordained the polity and laws of the Israelites, was named Osarsiph, from Osiris, he goes down to the root "*ar*," "eye," and the form "*Osar*" used by him may be equivalent to "*Ar*."

Cheremon, according to the extract of Josephus,

distinguished between Moses and Aaron, whom he calls Moses and *Joseph* (?). Here some copyist mistook *Arsiph* for *Joseph*. He calls them "scribes"—that is, educated men—adding that *Joseph*—that is, *Arsiph*—"was a *sacred* scribe." It is remarkable that Cheremon and Lysimachus, in their confused and garbled accounts of the Exodus, substitute Pelusium for Avaris, indicating that the site of Avaris was in the vicinity of the later Pelusium. Now, is it not plain that the simple-minded Cheremon called *Arsiph* a "sacred scribe" because he was, in fact, a *priest*?

We will now retrace our steps, and briefly recapitulate some of the main points of the Bible account.

"After a long time" (sixty-six years) Ramesses II dies. Moses, who had lived as an exile in Midian for fully fifty years, hears the news, and prepares himself to lead his countrymen out of Egypt. Aaron, or *Arsiph*, visits his brother Moses at Mount Sinai, and arranges the details.

They go to Egypt, assemble the elders, and make known their plans. The people are taken from the works. Moses and Aaron stand before Pharaoh, and demand the release of the Israelites. Pharaoh complains that they have made the people rest from their burdens, and commands the taskmasters and officers of the people to increase their burdens. The people are put to work again, their burdens are increased, and when they fail to fulfill their task in making brick, their officers, whom Pharaoh's taskmasters had set over them, are beaten.

These events, we may say, culminate in the fifth

year of Menophthah's reign. Then come a series of plagues, the meaning of which I will not here inquire into. But it was at this time that the Libyans and their Mediterranean allies, the Sardinians, Sicilians, Lycians, Achaians, etc., invaded the Northwestern Delta, and turned things "upside down" in Egypt. While all of the energies of the Egyptians were bent upon expelling the dangerous foreign foes, the Israelites were again withdrawn from their works and assembled in one place. The Exodus proper took place twelve days after the great defeat of the Libyans; but there were many other foreigners, or so-called "impure people," in Egypt, besides the Israelites led out by Moses and Aaron. Josephus, it seems, found some mention of the Israelites in Manetho's work, for he tells us, "This is what the Egyptians relate about the Jews, *with much more*, which I omit for the sake of brevity;" but he applies to the Israelites in particular much that related to the "foreigners" in general. The monuments show that Menophthah remained in Egypt for about three years after the Exodus. *Papyri* of his third year show that he held control of the portion of Canaan bordering on the sea. In his eighth year there was carried into effect, according to Pharaoh's command, the passage of certain tribes of *Shasu* from the land of Edom through the fortress Menophthah, which is situated in Succoth (*Thuku*), to the lakes of the city of Pithom (*Per-tum*, Patumos), of *Mer-nu-ptah Hotep-hir-ma*, which are in the land of *Thuku*, in order to feed themselves and to feed their herds on the possessions of Pharaoh.

The explanation of this is found in the Exodus of the Israelites, for their departure had left these lands unoccupied. There are no dated inscriptions, or *papyri*, after the eighth year of Menophthah's reign. The Flight to Ethiopia, therefore, took place after he had reigned seven years and x months. In some of the lists Menophthah (written Amenophis by mistake) has eight years, showing that Manetho mentioned this portion of his reign and the thirteen years of the exile separately. In the pseudo-Sothis List, we find, transferred from this portion of Manetho's Lists, "No. 11 Akesephthres," with a reign of thirteen years. I am inclined to see in this *Hak Siphthas*—that is, the "hyk" *Sa-ptah*—and his queen, *Ta-user-et*, who reigned in Thebes during the absence of the real Pharaoh in Ethiopia. It seems that *Sa-ptah*, or Siphthah, remained in undisputed possession of Thebes and the South generally, for he had time to construct, and partially decorate, a large tomb in the necropolis of Thebes. It is tomb No. 14 of Baedeker, and lies between tomb No. 13, which bears the names of *Seti II*, and seems to have been abandoned, and tomb No. 15, belonging to *Seti II*. Tomb No. 14 was appropriated by *Set-necht*, a fact indicating that he was related to Queen *Ta-user-et*, whose sarcophagus was deposited in the great sarcophagus-chamber. An inscription at Syene proclaims that a high official named *Bai* put an end to some great "evil" by placing *Sa-ptah* on the throne of his father. This "evil," no doubt, was the state of anarchy caused by the flight of Menophthah.

Josephus tells us, upon the authority of Manetho, that after the expiration of the ill-fated period of thirteen years Menophthah returned from Ethiopia with a great army, as did his son Ramesses with another army also; and both of them joined battle with the Canaanites and the "polluted people," and beat them and slew a great many of them, and pursued them to the bounds of Syria."

These "polluted people" could not have been the Israelites who were led out into the Wilderness by Moses and Aaron, because, according to the Scripture account, they were no longer in Egypt. Manetho is fully borne out as to this great victory and the pursuit to the borders of Syria by existing monuments. *Seti II*, for instance, erected buildings in Thebes, Heliopolis, and other parts of Egypt, fortified the frontiers of Palestine, guarded the wells in that vicinity, and re-established the authority of Pharaoh over Egypt from Pelusium to Nubia. But his glorious and eventful reign seems to have been cut short, and it is possible that Menophthah outlived him.

The tomb of *Amen-mes* (No. 10 in Baedeker) was constructed *before* that of Ramesses III, and, as I judge from its position, *after* those of Siphthah and *Seti II*. It is probable, therefore, that Amenmeses (Amenemes) succeeded Seti II as actual ruler at Thebes for twenty-six years. Although, in the authorized list, Menophthah had nineteen years and six months and Sethos fifty-one years, Manetho in the body of his work explained that Menophthah actually reigned eight years (seven years+x months) and *Hyk*

Siphthah thirteen years (twelve years and x months), after which Amenmes reigned twenty-six years. We have seen that Eusebius followed the unknown author of the bogus Sothis List wherever he could. Thus we find in one of his lists of the Nineteenth Dynasty :

|                        |         |
|------------------------|---------|
| Amenephthis, . . . . . | 8 years |
| Amenemea, . . . . .    | 26 "    |

The reign of *Amen-mes* may have been divided by the epoch 1464 B. C., as follows :

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Amen-mes, before epoch, "Miamous," . . . . . | 12 years |
| Amen-mes, after epoch, "Chamoia," . . . . .  | 14 "     |

It is certain, therefore, that there were troublous times in Egypt, particularly in Lower Egypt, between the death of *Seti II* and the accession of *Set-necht* ; and it was during this period of Egyptian imbecility that the Israelites conquered Canaan.

Petrie, following the corrupt form of the name, identifies "Amenophis," Manetho's Pharaoh of the Exodus, with Amenophthis III. But this identification is wholly untenable. When Josephus produced Manetho as a witness to the antiquity of the Jewish nation, he set down the reigns of seventeen kings, beginning with Tethmosis and ending with Menophthah, here expressly called Amenophis. In this list, as we have demonstrated, the reign of Sethos was entirely omitted, and the side-reigns of Acherres, etc., erroneously inserted. This gave Josephus an opportunity to introduce Sethos and Ramesses a second time, and thus swell his total to five hundred and eighteen years ; but he assures us that Manetho

introduced this Amenophis *after* Ramesses, the son of Sethos, who reigned sixty-six years. By this, Amenophis III is necessarily excluded. Again, the son of this supposed Amenophis was named Sethos (*Seti II*), but was familiarly called Ramesses after his grandfather Ramesses II. By this also Amenophis III is necessarily excluded.

### THE IA-NIM, OR IONIANS

One of the most remarkable surprises to be found in the Pyramid Texts is the frequent mention of the *Ia-nim*, or Ionians. The name *Ia-nim*, meaning the *Ia*, or *Io*, collectively (all), as it is written in the Pyramids of the Sixth Dynasty, beginning with that of *Teta* (Tithoes), appears unchanged, and written with the same identical hieroglyphs, on the "Rosetta Stone," where it is rendered "Ionians." In the Lists of the "Nine Foreign Nations" (Nine Bows), dating from the earliest times, the *Ia-nim* are described as inhabiting "the islands of the sea," that is, Mediterranean Sea, "and numerous foreign lands."

There can be no doubt, therefore, that the *Ia-nim* of the Pyramid inscriptions and Egyptian monuments generally, were the Ionians, or Greeks, as they were afterwards called.

The route to the lands of the Ionians is accurately described in the Pyramid of *Teta*, more than 3,100 years before the Christian era. We there read: "Thy two sisters, Isis and Nephthis, come to thee (the deceased *Teta*), and they convey thee past the town of *Kem-et-ur-et*, in thine name of '*Kem-ur*,' and past

the fortress (*anebu*, 'walls') of *Uaz-et-ur-et* ('Great Green') in thine name of the sea of *Uaz-ur*, and thou passeth (?) the great bend (*ur-et shen-et*) at the lake (bay) of *Shen-et ur-et*, and thou circlest around the circle which encircles the Ionians (*em-ku deben-te shen-et em deben pacher Ia-nim*)," etc. (Pyramid Texts, pages 122-123, Teta, lines 274 and 275.)

However we may choose to render the archaic language of the inscription, its general meaning (owing to the free use of determinatives) is clear and unmistakable. The journey thus briefly sketched, was from Egypt, by way of the town of *Kem-et Ur-et*, on the lake of *Kem-ur*, and the fortress of *Uaz-et Ur-et*, on the sea of *Uaz-ur*, and around the great bend, at the southeast corner of the Mediterranean Sea, and the corresponding curve formed by the Gulf of Iskenderun, at the northeastern corner of this sea, to Ionia and the countless islands of the Grecian Archipelago, including, of course, Greece itself, which was also regarded as an island. At the beginning of the Sixth Dynasty it is almost certain that the Red Sea extended farther north than it does now, and included Lake Timsah, then called "*she*," or sea, of *Kem-ur*, "Great Black," in contradistinction to *Uaz-ur* (Sax. water, Ger. wasser), "Great Green." The town of *Kem-ur* was situated on the gulf (now lake) at the eastern end of the Wady Tumilat, probably in the vicinity of the later Pithom (Patumos, *Per-tum*), and near the present line of the Suez Canal, where it served to guard one of the main approaches to the upper Delta.

The fortress (*anebu*, "walls") of *Uaz-ur* was situated near the Mediterranean, in the vicinity of the later Pelusium, east of the mouth of the Pelusiac arm of the Nile. The great commercial highway leading from Egypt to Canaan, and thence to Asia Minor, passed through, and was controlled by, this important fortress. In the time of the Nineteenth Dynasty, the main road seems to have been by way of Tanis, crossing the Pelusiac arm of the Nile north of *Kem-ur*, at the point still called "El-kantarrah," the Bridge. As late as the beginning of the Twelfth Dynasty, however, to judge from the route taken by *Sa-nuh-et*, in his celebrated flight from Egypt to the land of Canaan, the main road to Asia followed the Wady Tumilat to the sea of *Kem-ur*.

It will be in the nature of a surprise to modern historians to learn that, 2,000 years before the "Siege of Troy," Greece, Ionia, and the neighboring islands were inhabited by the great nation of the Ionians, (for *Ia-nim*, "the Io collectively," points to a people divided into many nations and spread over a wide extent of territory), Moses, who drew from ancient Egyptian sources, derives Iavan (Ianim) from Iapheth (*Ia-pet*), and tells us that by these (Iavan and his so-called sons) were the islands of the Gentiles settled. The monuments also abound in allusions to these "islands of the sea."

As Japheth was "born" one hundred years *before* the Flood, to wit, about 2448 B. C., and his son Iavan *after* the Flood, the statement of Moses as to the birth of Japheth, etc., would seem to be anachron-

istic by at least seven hundred years, in view of the facts now revealed by contemporary monuments; but we must bear in mind that, in the ancient list copied by Moses, Noah, Japheth, and Iavan, represent nations organized into governments modeled after the Egyptian pattern; hence they are represented as "born" at certain dates. For example, Japheth was born when the *Ia-pet*, or the "foreign Io," settled in the northwestern angle of the Delta, were organized into a separate, independent government. Although the "Io collectively" inhabited the "islands of the sea," Ionia and Greece, for centuries prior to the Flood, they were organized into the governments named by Ionians who had emigrated from Egypt after the Hyksos Flood. The Dispersion was from Egypt, and not from the alluvial plains of Babylonia.

The Greeks preserved a recollection of their early connection with Egypt, and of the fact that their civilization and religion were derived, in part at least, from the Egyptians. A number of legends embodying this recollection has come down to us through the classical writers. The wanderings of Io, the daughter of Inachus, king of Argos, represent the migrations of a portion of the ancient *Ia* from Greece to Egypt. Crossing the Hellespont, and following the coast, they wandered through Asia Minor, around the Gulf of Iskenderun, through Canaan and the desert separating that country from Egypt, to finally settle down on the banks of the Nile. The "Suppliants" of Æschylus is founded on these legends,

according to which Io, driven to Egypt, gave birth to a son called Epaphos, who founded a settlement of Ionians in the Delta.

The "suppliant daughters of Danaus" claim to be descended from these Ionian settlers in Egypt. The city of Argos, the capital of Inachus, was situated in the "Apian" plain, so named after Apis (*Api*, Nile), who cleared it of wild beasts, and introduced the arts of civilization. We have seen that the Apis-bull, the symbol of the Nile, or Egyptus, was venerated in Memphis from the time of King Binothris of the Second Dynasty, or as far back as 3894 B. C. It is clear, therefore, that civilization was carried from Egypt to Argos, and not from Argos to Egypt.

Inachus, it seems, was contemporary with Aahmes, and, as the "foreign Io," according to Moses, established a government in Egypt one hundred years before the Hyksos Invasion (for that is what is meant by Japheth, son of Noah), it is plain that Io could not have been the daughter of Inachus. Epaphus, at first sight, seems to be *Apapi*, which has come down to us in the Greek forms Apophis and Epiphi, but I am satisfied that it is a corrupt form of Apis. We have seen that "Sethos, or *Seti I*, assumed the epoch-title "Osiropis," that is, *Hus-ir-api*, at the beginning of the Sothiac month of Epiphi, 1584 B. C. This king, as his name indicates, was devoted to *Set*, or Typhon, who was identified with *Apap*. The subtle blending of Osiris and *Api* in the title "Osiropis" was the cause of the remarkable con-

fusion between the ancient symbols of good and evil, to wit, Osiris and Typhon. There seems to be some distant connection between *Api* and *Apap*, for the latter is simply a duplication of *Ap*. Now Manetho tells us that Sethos was called by the other name Egyptus, which is plainly *Api*, or Osiropis. In Homer's time the Nile was invariably called Egyptus, from Apis, the symbol of the Nile. It was thus that Sutech, or *Set*, "the serpent more subtle than any beast of the field," seduced Life, the ancient religion of Egypt.

The hopeless confusion in which the subject became involved is reflected in the Greek legends, where the brothers Danaus and Egyptus appear as sons of Bel, or Belus, who was descended from Epaphus, the son of Io. Now Bel, or Baal, is but another name for Sutech, the so-called "lord god" of the serpent-worshiping Hyksos, who was identified with *Set* and *Apap*. The "old serpent" was the symbol of all these Typhonic personations. Thus Danaus and Egyptus (Harmais and Sethos) appear as sons of *Set*, who is represented as the offspring of Io, through Epaphus. The goddess Io was often pictured with the horns of a cow, showing that she was originally the same as Hathor, or Isis, the consort of Osiris; but the blending of Osiris and *Api*, the symbols of good and evil, led to the mistake of identifying Osiris, as well as *Api*, with Egyptus, or the Nile. *Api* and *Apap* may have been derived from *Set*, or Bel, but Osiris was certainly not. On the other hand, Osiris was connected with Isis, or Io, but Bel

was not. The confusion following the amalgamation of the symbols of good and evil seems to have affected all alike, except Moses. Josephus regarded *Set* and his posterity as eminently good and virtuous, that is, as Osirian, and attempted to derive the Jews from this symbol of evil and darkness. Several modern Egyptologists mistake Isis for the alluvial plain of Egypt, and Osiris for the Nile.

In the "Suppliants," the "daughters of Danaus," the offspring of Io, Isis, or Life, are represented as fleeing from the unlawful embraces of the "sons of Egyptus," that is, *Api*, *Set*, or *Bel*.

The separation of the Ionians from the common stock must have occurred at a very ancient date, for they were already in their well-known seats at the beginning of the Sixth Dynasty.

The affinity between the ancient Egyptian and ancient Greek languages, however, is not so strongly marked as it is between the former and the ancient Saxon and Scandinavian languages. The reasons for this appear incidentally throughout this work.

Suffice it to say that the mummies and portrait-statues of *Seti*, or Egyptus, and his son Ramesses, the portrait-statues of *Chufu*, *Chafra*, *Usertasen I*, etc., and the mummy of Menthusuphis I, all reveal the pure European type as exemplified by the Greek and Germanic nations.

In the Pyramid Texts, page 167, we find: "(*Hus-iri Pepa*) *ur-te deben-te em deben-nu Ia-nim*," which Maspero interprets thus: "And here thou art grand, and thou circleth around the circle of the *Hau-nibu*."

This is repeated (Pyramid Texts, pages 265 and 342) Menthusuphis I, line 91, and Pepi II, line 98, etc.

The journey of the *ka* of the deceased Pharaoh to the distant lands of the Ionians demonstrated that the ancient Egyptians recognized the close relationship existing between the two great nations.

### THE 1,050 YEARS OF MANETHO'S THIRD BOOK

Manetho's Third Book opened at the Sothiac era 1324 B. C., which was known to the Greeks as the "Era of Menophres," and closed at the end of Nektanebos' (*Necht-neb-ef*) reign, or 339 B. C. Thus there were in the direct, or chronological line, exactly nine hundred and eighty-five years. Now add to this sum the sixty-five years of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty of Ethiopians who ruled contemporaneously with the four native kings of the Twenty-fourth Dynasty, and we have the 1,050 years of Manetho's Third Book. The separate dynasties stood thus:

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| "Era of Menophres," . . . . .                      | 1324 B. C. |
| Twentieth Dynasty of seven Theban kings, . . .     | 185        |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1139 B. C. |
| Twenty-first Dynasty of seven Tanite kings, . .    | 130        |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1009 B. C. |
| Twenty-second Dynasty of nine Bubastite kings, .   | 220        |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 789 B. C.  |
| Twenty-third Dynasty of three Tanite kings (58),   | 59         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 730 B. C.  |
| Twenty-fourth Dynasty of four Saite (?) kings, . . | 65         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 665 B. C.  |
| Twenty-sixth Dynasty of six Saite kings, . . .     | 140        |
|  | <hr/>      |
| Beginning of Persian Dynasty, . . . . .            | 525 B. C.  |

The Twenty-fifth Dynasty of three Ethiopian kings reigned sixty-five years contemporaneously with the Twenty-fourth Dynasty, and is, therefore, omitted in the direct or chronological line.

When the lists were falsified in order to make it appear that the Eighteenth Dynasty commenced at 1648 B. C., and that the Nineteenth Dynasty, and Manetho's Second Book also, ended at 1181 B. C., the accepted date of the Fall of Troy, the totals of the Twentieth and succeeding Dynasties of the Second Book, down to the Persian Dynasty, were systematically reduced, as follows:

|  | Africanus. | Eusebius.  |
|--|------------|------------|
| Fall of Troy, . . . . .                    | 1181 B. C. | 1181 B. C. |
| Twentieth Dynasty, . . . . .               | <u>135</u> | <u>178</u> |
|  | 1046 B. C. | 1003 B. C. |
| Twenty-first Dynasty, . . . . .            | <u>114</u> | <u>130</u> |
|  | 932 B. C.  | 873 B. C.  |
| Twenty-second Dynasty, . . . . .           | <u>120</u> | <u>49</u>  |
|  | 812 B. C.  | 824 B. C.  |
| Twenty-third Dynasty, incl. Zet, . . . . . | <u>89</u>  | <u>44</u>  |
|  | 723 B. C.  | 780 B. C.  |
| Twenty-fourth Dynasty, . . . . .           | <u>6</u>   | <u>44</u>  |
|  | 717 B. C.  | 736 B. C.  |
| Twenty-fifth Dynasty, . . . . .            | <u>40</u>  | <u>44</u>  |
|  | 677 B. C.  | 692 B. C.  |
| Twenty-sixth Dyn., originally, . . . . .   | <u>151</u> | <u>167</u> |
| Beginning of Persian Dynasty, . . . . .    | 525 B. C.  | 525 B. C.  |

Again we notice an effort on the part of Eusebius to correct the errors in the Lists of Africanus, but,

as he left the beginning of the Twentieth Dynasty at 1181 B. C., the result attained was the reverse of that intended.

We shall notice the changes more particularly under the respective heads.

### **TWENTIETH DYNASTY OF SEVEN DIOSPOLITAN KINGS**


In the Lists of Africanus and Eusebius, the Twentieth Dynasty, with the exception of the heading, "Twentieth Dynasty of twelve (?) Diospolitan Kings," and the totals one hundred and eighty-five and one hundred and seventy-eight years, is a perfect blank—the names of the kings, and their separate reigns also, have entirely disappeared! It is evident that the pious forger of the pseudo-Sothis List, who used these names and the last five names of the Nineteenth Dynasty to fill out an actual blank between the Twelfth and Seventeenth Dynasties in his fraudulent list, also tampered with the Manethonian Lists of the Twentieth Dynasty, for the twelve kings of the present heading represent the seven kings of this dynasty and the five kings of the Nineteenth Dynasty which were surreptitiously removed.

Manetho's Twentieth Dynasty begins at the Sothiac era 1324 B. C. As we have just seen, the first seven years of the reign of Ramesses Chamois Menophres were before this era, and were assigned to the second cycle, and accounted for in Manetho's second

Book. The Twentieth Dynasty and Manetho's Third Book, therefore, begin with the epoch-reign of Menophres, that is, in the eighth year of the reign of the king Ramesses, who stands at the head of this Dynasty.

The seven kings of this dynasty, who reigned one hundred and eighty-five years after the era 1324 B. C., that is, from 1324 B. C. to 1139 B. C., appear in the pseudo-Sothis List immediately before the Hyksos kings. After they were removed from the Twentieth Dynasty they were no longer in the way of the early Bible chronographers, and, for this reason, have come down to us undisturbed. As we have already explained, these kings presented an insurmountable obstacle to the artificial chronological schemes of the Bible chronographers, owing to the fact that the sixth king of this dynasty, Ramesses Ior-basse, was the well-known epoch-king of Paophi, 1204 B. C., called Phuoro (not Thuoris), or "King Nile," during whose reign the "Fall of Troy" occurred.

We know from the monuments that all the kings of this dynasty, as well as the kings of the Nineteenth Dynasty who followed Ramesses III, were named Ramesses; but each of them also bore an additional name. Thus Ramesses III was known as Ramesses *Hyk-ôn-nut*, from which the abbreviated compound name "Rhampsakes" was derived. In fact, it was as necessary then as it has been ever since, to distinguish a succession of kings bearing the same name by distinctive titles. We need not be surprised, there-



fore, to find the seven kings of this dynasty distinguished by separate additional titles.

I do not think that the order of succession of these seven kings has been changed; for the epoch-reign of Ramesses Menophres, which was (36-7) twenty-nine years, still heads the list, and the reign of Ramesses *Iar-bash* (Gushing River), Phuoro (*Pa-iar*, "The River," i. e., Nile) or "King Nile," still covers the epoch of Paophi (*Pa-api*, The Nile) 1204 B. C. But we must call attention to a significant, tell-tale fact regarding the distinctive titles of the first king of this dynasty. His reign commenced about 1331 B. C., and the first seven years of the same were cut off and devoured by the standing female hippopotamus *Ta-ur-et* (Thaouris), the symbol of the Sothiac year, who is depicted with the crocodile, the symbol of a Sothiac month, upon her back. At the beginning of the new Sothiac year (1324 B. C.) the "re-born" king was "re-crowned," and started in, as it were, upon a new reign. He received such epoch-titles as *Cha-em-uas*, "Crowned in Thebes," *Aa-tahu-ti*, "Offspring of Thoth," and *Mer-nu-ph'ra*, "Beloved by the Sun." The forger of the pseudo-Sothis List was too shrewd to transfer any of these titles. He, therefore, entered the first king under the name of Ramesses only, but gave him the epoch-reign of twenty-nine years, instead of the entire reign, which was thirty-six years.

We will now bring these kings forth from their hiding-place, and restore them to the Twentieth Dynasty, where they belong.

TWENTIETH DYNASTY OF SEVEN DIOSPOLITAN KINGS

|                                   |           |           |            |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1. Ramesses (Athothis), . . . . . | 29 years, | . . . . . | 1324 B. C. |
|                                   |           |           | 29         |
| 2. Ramessomenes, . . . . .        | 15 "      | . . . . . | 1295 B. C. |
|                                   |           |           | 15         |
| 3. (Ramesse—) Usimares, . . . . . | 31 "      | . . . . . | 1280 B. C. |
|                                   |           |           | 31         |
| 4. Ramesse-seos, . . . . .        | 23 "      | . . . . . | 1249 B. C. |
|                                   |           |           | 23         |
| 5. Ramessameno, . . . . .         | 19 "      | . . . . . | 1226 B. C. |
|                                   |           |           | 19         |
| 6. Ramesse-Iorbasse (King Nile),  | 39 "      | . . . . . | 1207 B. C. |
|                                   |           |           | 39         |
| 7. Ramesse-Uaphru, . . . . .      | 29 "      | . . . . . | 1168 B. C. |
|                                   |           |           | 29         |
| Total, . . . . .                  | 185 "     | . . . . . | 1139 B. C. |

Pliny the younger refers to King Nile as “Rham-  
essis who reigned when Ilium was captured,” that is,  
circa 1181 B. C.

Dikaearchos placed the reign of King Nile at  
four hundred and thirty-six years before the first  
Olympiad, that is, circa 1212 B. C., which date is  
only five years before his accession. The king who  
became so celebrated as King Nile was the next to  
the last king who bore the name of Ramesses. *Pa-iar*,  
or *Phuoro*, and *Iar-bash*, or *Iorbasse*, are titles de-  
scriptive of the Nile, that is, “The River.” Nile it-  
self, as we have demonstrated, is the plural form of  
*Pa-iar*, to wit, *Na-iar-u*, *Nahal-u*, *Neil-u*, “The  
Rivers,” which was applied to the arms, or “heads,”  
of the river in the Delta. The Greeks, who came to

Egypt by sea, and sailed up these arms, became acquainted with the plural form *Na-iar-u*. Homer calls the river Egyptos.

Certain scientists have lately contended that the Sothiac system was invented about 136 A. D., when Sirius rose heliacally on the first day of Thoth; but the use of such epoch-titles as Iorbasse, Phuoro, Athothis, King Nile, etc., by Manetho, Eratosthenes, and Dikaearchos, not to speak of the Turin payrus, where a king of the Sixteenth Dynasty is termed *Ian-ab*, shows that it is frivolous and groundless. In his "Book of Kings," Lepsius has published the names and titles of the ten kings who succeeded Ramesses III, and bore the name of Ramesses. He has numbered them according to certain indications found on the monuments, from IV to XIII inclusive; but this enumeration was tentative only, and never intended to be final. Maspero's arrangement of these kings differs somewhat from that of Lepsius. Numbers IX and XIII of Lepsius are marked as epoch-kings by the title *Cha-em-uas*, and, if Ramesses IX is King Nile, Ramesses XIII must be King Menophres. Now it happens that Ramesses XIII Chamois was called *Iyk-ôn-nut*, and bore the Horus-title *Mer-nu-ph'ra*. As *Ânu* ruled the last quarter of the year, the title *Iyk-Ânu* points to the seven years before the era, 1324 B. C. None of the other kings has a title corresponding to Menophres, and it is significant that *Mernuphra* is this king's Horus-title; that is, title in *spe*.

Ramesses IX Chamois bears the additional title

*Nofer-ka-ra*, or *Nephercheres*, which, in my opinion, symbolizes the completion of a Sothiac month: “Perfect is the *Ka* of *Ra*.”

Until I have had an opportunity to examine the works and monuments of these kings on the spot, I must content myself with the following provisional arrangement, which is, to some extent, conjectural only:

|         |                              |                |          |
|---------|------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| No. 18. | Ramesses, . . . . .          | Ramesses XIII, | 29 years |
| “ 19.   | Ramessomenes, . . . . .      | Ramesses VII,  | 15 “     |
| “ 20.   | Ramesse Usermares, . . . . . | Ramesses XII,  | 31 “     |
| “ 21.   | Ramesse Sethos, . . . . .    | Ramesses VIII, | 23 “     |
| “ 22.   | Ramessameno, . . . . .       | Ramesses X,    | 19 “     |
| “ 23.   | Ramesse-Iorbasse, . . . . .  | Ramesses IX,   | 39 “     |
| “ 24.   | Ramesse-Uaphru, . . . . .    | Ramesses XI,   | 29 “     |

The priests informed Diodorus that all these kings, except King Nile, abandoned themselves to lives of ease and luxury. The monuments confirm this in a general way. Menophres, the first of these kings, was active as a builder at Thebes, notably in the Temple of Chons, who there took the place *Har-pa-krat*, “Horus the Babe.” A list of revenues collected by Pinehas, “King’s son of Cush,” is dated in his twelfth year. A papyrus now in Turin is dated in his seventeenth year. Lastly, a stela of the scribe Hora of Abydus, now in the Cairo Museum, was set up on the eighth day of Messori in his twenty-seventh year. These dates agree with his epoch-reign of twenty-nine years. We have mentioned his tomb in another chapter. The second king, Ramesses VII, has left a tomb in the Biban-el-Moluk at Thebes, and is highly praised in a papyrus now in the Turin Museum.

The third king, Ramesses XII, is mentioned in a long inscription formerly set up in the Temple of Chons. We read that he was in Naharain, as was his custom every year, and the kings of all the nations came with humility and friendship to the person of Pharaoh, bringing gifts of gold, silver, etc. The king of *Bachtana* brought his tribute, and at the head of it his eldest daughter, whose beauty pleased Pharaoh so much that he made her his wife, bestowing upon her the name *Nôferu-ra*. This inscription bears the dates, year 15, Payni 22d, year 26, month of Pachons, and year 33, Mechir 13th. Although Manetho gives this king thirty-one years only, the slight discrepancy of one year may be owing to a joint-reign.

The fourth king, Ramesses VIII, who is credited with twenty-three years, has left but few monuments, and we consequently know little about him. Under his predecessor, Egypt seems to have held Canaan and Syria, as she probably did in the reign of Ramesses III, but this possession of Canaan may have been limited to a comparatively narrow strip along the seacoast; for the Israelites were certainly in possession of the eastern and central portions of Canaan at this time, and we find no mention in the Scriptures of the presence of Egyptian garrisons or officials.

The fifth king, Ramesses X, like his predecessor, seems to have been one of the kings mentioned by Diodorus, who spent their lives in idleness, pleasures, and luxurious living. The monuments, therefore, have little to report about him, but they mention the first, sixth, and eighth years of his reign. He con-

structed a tomb in the Biban-el-moluk, which is now badly ruined, an obelisk in Bologna bears his name, and an ostrakon in the British Museum shows his cartouche repeated three times.

The sixth king, Ramesses IX, has been sufficiently mentioned as "King Nile." His tomb accords well with his long reign of thirty-nine years; for it is large and of fine workmanship, and decorated with important astronomical representations. Were it not for two vases, bearing the name of Ramesses XI, in connection with an Apis-bull, which were found in the "Serapeum" by Mariette, we would know absolutely nothing about the last king of this dynasty, so far as the monuments are concerned.

Much has been written about the supposed usurpation of the crown by the kings of the Twenty-first Dynasty, but no evidence of such usurpation has ever been found. The reigns of these kings average about twenty-eight years, but they no longer display the energy and ability which made the names of Ramesses II and Ramesses III so celebrated.

It is possible that the Ramessides went down before the growing power of the Ethiopian kingdom. We shall have more to say about this in the following chapters.

## **TWENTY-FIRST DYNASTY OF SEVEN TAN-ITE KINGS**

The Lists of the Twenty-first Dynasty have come down to us almost unchanged. The List of Eusebius has reached us intact, the Armenian Version and

Syncellus agreeing throughout. The lists are as follows:

| Africanus.            |          | Eusebius.             |          |
|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|
| 1. Smendia, . . . .   | 26 years | 1. Smendia, . . . .   | 26 years |
| 2. Psusennes, . . . . | 46 "     | 2. Psusennes, . . . . | 41 "     |
| 3. Nephercherea, . .  | 4 "      | 3. Nephercherea, . .  | 4 "      |
| 4. Amenophthis, . .   | 9 "      | 4. Amenophthis, . .   | 9 "      |
| 5. Osochor, . . . .   | 6 "      | 5. Osochor, . . . .   | 6 "      |
| 6. Psinachea, . . . . | 9 "      | 6. Psinachea, . . . . | 9 "      |
| 7. Psusennes, . . . . | 14(?) "  | 7. Psusennes, . . . . | 35 "     |
| <hr/>                 |          | <hr/>                 |          |
| Total, . . . .        | 130 "    | Total, . . . .        | 130 "    |

The separate numbers of Eusebius still foot up the required total of one hundred and thirty years. The last reign of Africanus is an evident mistake, owing to the epoch-reign of the first Psusennes.

Before we take up the separate reigns, we wish to call attention to the pseudo-Sothis List. The blank left by the Twentieth Dynasty was filled out as follows:

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| 59. Athothia, who is also Psusanos, . . . . . | 28 years |
| 60. Kenkenes, . . . . .                       | 39 "     |
| 61. Uennephia, . . . . .                      | 42 "     |
| 62. Susakeim, . . . . .                       | 34 "     |

These are the names of four successive epoch-kings.

"Athothis, who is also Psusanus," with a reign of twenty-eight years, is one of the shrewdest combinations of the forger of this list. The real Athothis, that is, the first king of the Twentieth Dynasty, who reigned twenty-nine years after the era 1324 B. C., had been removed to a safe place, and the list had been so manipulated that the false Athothis stood at A. M. 4369, or 1131 B. C.

The forger was well aware that this date was

eight years after the beginning of the Twenty-first Dynasty. Now it happened that Psusanos I was the epoch-king of Athyr, 1084 B. C., twenty-eight years and x months of his reign lying before, and thirteen years and x months after this epoch. Athoris (*Hait-har-i*), therefore, might have forty-two, twenty-eight, or fourteen years. The proof of this can be found in number 43 of the pseudo-Sothis List, where Athoris appears with twenty-nine years (28 years + x months). A very slight twist of the pen converted Athoris into Athothis, who received twenty-eight instead of twenty-nine years, and was identified with Psusanos I instead of Ramesses.

Kenkenes is one of the epoch-titles of King Nile, but he has the full thirty-nine years of Ramesse-Ior-basse.

Uennephis has forty-two years, the full reign of Psusanos I. We have already explained how *Uon-nofer*, or Uen-nephis, came to serve as an epoch-title for the month of Hathor. We shall have occasion to comment on Susakeim, that is, Usarkon, in the next dynasty.

The Twentieth Dynasty came to a close in the year 1139 B. C. Beginning at this date, which is absolute, we have the following result:

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Beginning of Dynasty, . . . . .          | 1139 B. C. |
| Smendis, . . . . .                       | 26         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1113 B. C. |
| Psusanos I, before epoch (28), . . . . . | 29         |
|  | <hr/>      |
| Epoch of Athyr, . . . . .                | 1084 B. C. |
| Psusanos I, after epoch (14), . . . . .  | 13         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1071 B. C. |

If the reigns, as given by Africanus and Eusebius, had not been reduced to years, the Sothiac division of the reign of Psusanos I would exactly coincide with the epoch. In this case, twenty-eight years before, and fourteen years after, the epoch, might be as correct as twenty-nine and thirteen. Some one, by mistake, has inserted these fourteen years of Psusanos I in the place of the thirty-five years of Psusanos II, in the List of Africanus, thus affording us an additional proof of the absolute correctness of Manetho's List. The reader will now understand why Athothis, that is, Athoris, with twenty-eight or twenty-nine years before the epoch 1084 B. C., was also called Psusanos.

The "great city," Thebes, after being the imperial capital for nearly seven hundred years, was suddenly and unaccountably eclipsed at the end of the Twentieth Dynasty. How and why this occurred, we have not yet discovered. The kings of the Twenty-first Dynasty were of Tanis, the Zoan of the Bible, and the monuments show that this city, once a favorite resort of the Hyksos, was, in fact, the capital during the one hundred and thirty years of this dynasty.

The first king of this dynasty is generally called *Hir-har* and *Sa-amén*. I have shown that the sparrowhawk above the sickle of the moon is not *Mcht*, but *Menthú*, for the first planet above the moon is Mars, or *Menthú*. I do not believe that the sparrowhawk below the sign for heaven can be read *Pc-har* or *Hir-har*, but that it is a compound sign like the one for *Menthú* just mentioned. When Smendes mounted the

throne, 1139 B. C., Horus was below the horizon in the Sothiac year; for Sothis rose on the first day of Athyr about 1084 B. C., or fifty-five years thereafter. All attempts to derive Smendes from *Sa-amen* have proved failures, and these failures have led the latest historian of ancient Egypt into the error of supposing that there were two dynasties ruling at this time, one at Tanis; the other, the so-called priest-kings, at Thebes. There is no doubt, however, that the Twenty-first Dynasty of Tanis ruled over all Egypt. Recent excavations at Tanis have shown that Smendes, who called himself *Mer-amen* at Thebes, was sometimes called *Mer-menthu* at Tanis. This discovery, it seems to me, explains the origin of the name Smendes, which has vexed scholars for so many years, for Smendes is the correct Greek form of *Sa-menthu*.

Pliny ascribes an obelisk to Zmante, which appears to be another form of Smendes. This view is fortified by the fact that this king caused his names to be engraved on the two obelisks of Heliopolis which were taken to Alexandria, and thence to London and New York. When the obelisk was pointed out to Pliny, the name and titles of *Sa-amen* led the guide to ascribe its erection to this king, who was called *S'menthe* or *S'monthe*. Ismande is a modification of Zmante, analagous to Isment, Esneh, etc. Did not *Har-menthu* become Hermonthis? On the other hand, it is barely possible that the present form of the name in the lists is due to the forger of the pseudo-Sothis List. After the four epoch-kings just

mentioned we find, instead of Smendes, the following series:

|                             |          |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| 63. Psuenos, . . . . .      | 25 years |
| 64. Ammenophia, . . . . .   | 9 "      |
| 65. Nephercherea, . . . . . | 6 "      |
| 66. Saïtes (?), . . . . .   | 15 "     |
| 67. Psinaches, . . . . .    | 9 "      |

When we compare this list with Africanus and Eusebius, the reign of Psuenos seems to correspond to that of Smendes, who may have reigned between twenty-five and twenty-six years. The name *Pa-notem* or *Pa-nozem*, "The Gentle One," is derived from a title of Hathor, who became the tutelar deity in 1084 B. C. *Pa-anchi*, "The Living One," a title of Isis, is now Psinaches, from Phianches (*Ps* for *Ph*), and it is probable that Psuenos and Psusennes are derived from Phunesemes (again *Ps* for *Ph*) influenced by Psusannos (*P'su-cha-nu-t*). We are accustomed to the form *Sa-amen*, but it may have been *Amen-sa*, or *Amenses*. We have already noticed the adroit combination "No. 55 Amenses, who is also Ammenemes, twenty-six years," of the pseudo-Sothis List. Undoubtedly this was the first reign of the Twenty-first Dynasty transferred to the Nineteenth Dynasty, and identified with the reigns of Amenephthis and Amenemes. Now what is No. 57 "Amendes," with twenty-seven years, but a slightly changed Amenses? It is but one step from Amendes to Smendes. The reign of Psusanos, Manetho's Psusennes, had been used, as Athoris, Athothis, and Uennephis, to "pad" other portions of the false list, and we need not be surprised to find it entirely wanting in the above list of the kings

of the Twenty-first Dynasty. We shall see, in the next chapter, how Usarkon II, who was the epoch-king of Choiahk 946 B. C., and who was similarly used under the name of "Susakeim," was eliminated from the Lists of Africanus and Eusebius, and finally disposed of.

Brugsch gives an excellent translation of an inscription, dated in the twenty-fifth year of this king, which contains an important "double date," to wit, "On the fourth intercalary day, the day of the birthday feast of Isis, at the same time as the feast of Amen on the new year."

Assuming that the twenty-fifth year applies to Psusennes I, and that this king had reigned twenty-five years at the time mentioned, Sirius rose heliacally on the 30th day of Paophi, and new year of the vague year coincided with the fifth intercalary day of the fixed year; hence the "birthday feast of Isis" and the "feast of Amen on the new year" were celebrated at the same time, proving that both years were used in fixing the feasts. In order to make the coincidence mathematically perfect, the feast of the new year, or the heliacal rising of Sothis, should have coincided with the first day of Thoth of the fixed year; but we are merely dealing with the celebration of festivals which lasted several days, and, therefore, overlapped. First, there was the birthday feast of Isis on the fourth intercalary day; then, the new year; and, lastly, the feast of Hathor.

Smendes claims that he maintained the boundaries of the empire, punished its enemies, and received

tribute from the princes of *Ruteniu* (Iltanu) or Syria. The kings of the Twentieth Dynasty, as we have seen, held the seacoast, or western portion of Canaan, and exacted tribute from the kings of Nahiaruna (*Na-iar-u-na*, "Nile-land") and adjoining countries. Was this the reason the Israelites were not able to take the western portion of Canaan?

But during the reign of Amenses or Smendes, Tiglath Pileser (*Takeloth Pal-assur*) conquered Nahiaruna and the adjoining countries to the Gulf of Isken-derun on the Mediterranean—that is, territory which had been tributary to the kings of Egypt—but we find no mention of Egyptian interference in the annals of the Assyrian monarch. The question of Ethiopian supremacy over Egypt will be considered in the next chapter. The kings of the Twenty-second Dynasty no longer bear Egyptian names, but purely Cushite or Ethiopian names, such as Nimroth, Takeloth, O-sarkon, and Sheshonk, alternate from the beginning to the end of the dynasty. After one hundred and thirty years of Cushite supremacy under native Egyptian kings, who were purposely placed near the eastern border of the Delta, a line of Cushite rulers mount the throne as Egyptian Pharaohs, and govern the country, subject to the great Ethiopian kingdom, for two hundred and twenty years.

### **TWENTY-SECOND DYNASTY OF NINE BUBASTITE KINGS**

The lists of the Twenty-second Dynasty, in their present form, contain but a fragment of Manetho's original list. There were nine kings in this dynasty,

and they reigned altogether two hundred and twenty years—that is, from 1009 B. C. to 789 B. C. We will now give the present lists:

| Africanus. |                           | Eusebius. |                           |
|------------|---------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|
| 1.         | Sesogchis, . . . 21 years | 1.        | Sesonchosis, . . 21 years |
| 2.         | Osorthon, . . . 15 "      | 2.        | Osorthon, . . . 15 "      |
| 3.         | } "Three others," 25 "    | 3.        | Takelothis, . . 13 "      |
| 4.         |                           |           |                           |
| 5.         | } "Three others," 42 "    |           |                           |
| 6.         |                           |           |                           |
| 7.         | } "Three others," 42 "    |           |                           |
| 8.         |                           |           |                           |
| 9.         | } "Three others," 42 "    |           |                           |
|            |                           |           |                           |
|            | Total, . . . 120 "        |           | Total, . . . 49 "         |

A more instructive example of the way in which the Manethonian Lists have been corrupted and falsified can not be found. The present List of Africanus foots up one hundred and sixteen years; but the total is still one hundred and twenty. After my initial discovery that Manetho's three books were arranged according to Sothiac Eras, I soon noticed that the original total of this dynasty had been two hundred and twenty years, but had been changed to one hundred and twenty years, because the list, as altered, footed up one hundred and sixteen only, and two hundred and twenty, therefore, appeared to be a palpable error. It then became evident that the third and fifth numbers assigned to the two groups of three unnamed kings, in each instance, represent the reign of one king only; and it did not take me long (guided by the monuments) to discover that the reign of twenty-five years belonged to the fifth king, and that of forty-two years to the last king of the dynasty; in

other words, that each of these numbers belonged to the last king of each group of three. It was known from the Apis-memorials that Sheshonk III, the seventh king of this dynasty, reigned fifty-three years; and the twenty-third year of Osarkon II, the fourth king of the dynasty, had been found on an Apis-tablet, and his twenty-first year in the "Festival Hall" erected by him at Bubastis. Aided by these dates, I next discovered that Susakeim, with thirty-four years, of the false Sothis List, was Osarkon II, slightly misspelt. Lastly, I found that *Pa-mui*, the eighth king, was entitled to seventeen years, and with these data succeeded in correctly restoring the list.

There were two Sothiac epochs, to wit: Choiahk, 964 B. C., and Tybi, 844 B. C., in the period of two hundred and twenty years covered by this dynasty, and the division of the epoch-reigns by these epochs proves that the restoration is astronomically correct.

Manetho's totals of the Twentieth and Twenty-first Dynasties, one hundred and eighty-five and one hundred and thirty years respectively, lead us unerringly from the era 1324 B. C. to the year 1009 B. C. Proceeding from this date, we have:

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| Beginning of Twenty-second Dynasty, . . . . .     | 1009 B. C.      |
| 1. Sesonchis (Sheshonk I), . . . . .              | 21              |
|   | <hr/> 988 B. C. |
| 2. Osorthon (Usarkon I), . . . . .                | 15              |
|   | <hr/> 973 B. C. |
| 3. Takelothis (Takeloth I, less than one year), . | 0               |
|   | <hr/> 973 B. C. |
| 4. Osorkon II, before epoch, . . . . .            | 9               |
|   | <hr/> 964 B. C. |
| Epoch of Choiahk, . . . . .                       |                 |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Brought forward</i> , . . . . .         | 964 B. C. |
| Osorkon II, after epoch, . . . . .         | 25        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 939 B. C. |
| 5. Sesonchis II, . . . . .                 | 25        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 914 B. C. |
| 6. Takelothis II, . . . . .                | 13        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 901 B. C. |
| 7. Sheshonk III, . . . . .                 | 53        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 848 B. C. |
| 8. <i>Pa-mui</i> , before epoch, . . . . . | 4         |
|  | <hr/>     |
| Epoch of Tybi, . . . . .                   | 844 B. C. |
| <i>Pa-mui</i> , after epoch, . . . . .     | 13        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 831 B. C. |
| 9. Sheshonk IV, . . . . .                  | 42        |
|  | <hr/>     |
| End of Dynasty, . . . . .                  | 789 B. C. |

It can do no harm to repeat that Manetho entered the epoch-reign of Osarkon II in some such fashion as this:

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Osarkon (Susakeim), entire reign, . . . . .       | 34 years |
| Osarkon, before epoch, as Herakles (?), . . . . . | 9 "      |
| Osarkon, after epoch, as Petubastes, . . . . .    | 25 "     |

Eusebius entered both of these fragments in his Twenty-third Dynasty, where they appear, as follows:

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Petubastes, . . . . .                      | 25 years |
| Osorthon, the Egyptian Herakles, . . . . . | 9 "      |

The name of the next epoch-king, *Pa-mui* (The Male Cat) is in itself an epoch-title of the month of Tybi. The author of the false Sothis List used the fragments of this reign to partly fill out the interval of fifty-one years between the reigns of Menophthah and *Set-necht* (Kertos), where they appear as "No. 51

Psammuthis, thirteen years," and "No. 52 . . . . four years." It seems that this king had no additional epoch-title to insert, so that the name belonging to the four years had to be left blank. Manetho's "*Pa-muis*," or "*P'sa-muis*," was mistaken for "Psamuthis," an epoch-title closely resembling it. We have already mentioned a most important and interesting synchronism between the reigns of Solomon and Shishak, the first king of this dynasty. This is also the first instance in which an Egyptian king is referred to by name in the Scriptures. As Solomon began to build the Temple in his fourth year, we have placed his accession at 1014 B. C., just five years before the beginning of this dynasty. We are told that Jeroboam remained in Egypt until the death of Solomon, which occurred about 992 B. C.

In the fifth year of the reign of Rehoboam, the son and successor of Solomon, Shishak, king of Egypt, came up against Jerusalem; and he took away the treasures of the house of the Lord and the king's treasures, and carried them off; as also the shields of gold which Solomon had made. We are also told that Shishak had 1,200 chariots, 60,000 horsemen, besides soldiers without number, and that the people that came with him out of Egypt were Libyans, Ethiopians, etc. Josephus says he had 1,200 chariots, 60,000 horsemen, and 400,000 footmen, the greater part of them Libyans and Ethiopians. He also says that Shishak took the strongest cities of Rehoboam's kingdom, and finally Jerusalem also, without fighting. As the reign of Sheshonk continued twenty-one years,

this conquest of Judah must be placed near the end of his reign, or about 988 B. C. An account of this expedition was engraved on the south wall of the Temple of Amen at Thebes, to the east of the room called the "Hall of the Bubastids." The spectator beholds the Egyptian king smiting the Jews. In the long rows of names, each of which is inclosed in a shield, we find that of "*Judah-melek*." The Egyptian scribe did not attempt to translate "King of Judah" into his own language, or to change the title to *Melek-Judah*, in order to make it conform to the rules of Egyptian grammar; but he faithfully transcribed it as he found it, "*Judah-melek*." It is by no means the name of a town. The determinative for a foreign land (*sat*) applies to Judah, and not to *melek* (king). The features of *Judah-melek* are typically Jewish—so perfectly so, in fact, that no one could possibly mistake his nationality. The conquered people are called '*Aamu* and *Fenechu*—that is, Canaanites and Jews—showing that the descendants of the '*Aamu* and the Jews (who are here confounded with the Phœnicians) were still dwelling side by side.

Sheshonk I built the hall at Karnak now known as the "Hall of the Bubastids," and the kings of this dynasty have perpetuated their names in it. The architect of this work has left an inscription in the quarries of Silsilis, which is dated in the twenty-first year of this king, informing us that his majesty had issued an order to hew the best stone of Silsilis, in order to make many and great monuments for the temple of his glorious father, Amen-ra, the lord of

Thebes, and to build a great temple-gate and a festival-hall for his father, Amen-ra, the king of the gods, and to inclose the house of the god with a thick wall. The architect assures his lord that he will not sleep by night nor slumber by day, but that the building shall go on uninterruptedly without rest or pause. The rich booty carried away from Jerusalem, and the desire to commemorate his victories, no doubt stimulated Sheshonk to undertake these works in the last year of his reign; for it is evident that the architect had been enjoined to use all possible expedition in completing the monuments.

Sheshonk no doubt regarded the powerful kingdom organized by Solomon with distrust and apprehension, and for this reason encouraged the pretensions of Jeroboam. A divided kingdom, while it still served as a bulwark against the rising power of the Assyrians, could not be dangerous to Egypt.

We will now examine another synchronism. Josephus tells us that Rehoboam reigned thirteen years after the capture of Jerusalem. His son, Abijah, who obtained the great victory over the Israelites, reigned after him about three years. Asa, the "Good King," under whom the country of the Israelites enjoyed peace for ten years, met and defeated Zarah, "King of Ethiopia." "When he had already reigned ten years, Zarah, King of Ethiopia, made an expedition with a great army of 900,000 footmen, 100,000 horsemen, and 300 chariots, and came as far as Mareshah, a city that belonged to the tribe of Judah." (*Antiq.* VIII, 12, 1.) The Scriptures, in their present form, call

him "Zarah, the Ethiopian," and estimate his army at 1,000,000 men and 300 chariots. We are told that the Lord terrified the "Ethiopians," and they fled; but in another chapter they are called "Ethiopians and Libyans." As this invasion occurred twenty-six years after the capture of Jerusalem by Sheshonk, or 962 B. C., the question arises, Was "Zarah, the Ethiopian," Osarkon II, King of Egypt, who continued to reign eight years after the defeat of the Ethiopian and Libyan army?

All will admit that some great change, or revolution, took place in Egypt when, at the beginning of the Twenty-first Dynasty, the capital and center of power were transferred from Thebes to Tanis. Why should the kings of the Twenty-first Dynasty have left the glorious capital, the "hundred-gated Thebes," in the "Land of the South," to take up their residence in the northeast angle of the Delta? Is it not remarkable that they seldom ventured to inclose their names and titles in the royal ovals? We are face to face with an effect which is exceptional in the annals of Egyptian history. Where and what was the disturbing cause?

The names of the royal family of the Twenty-second Dynasty are not Egyptian. Every Egyptologist will admit this. We find Egyptologists divided into two camps; one contending that the names are Assyrian, the other that they are Libyan. We are constrained to ask, What do these learned gentlemen mean by the terms "Assyrian" and "Libyan?" Nimrod, or Nimroth, Sargon, Sarkon, Sarkon-a, or

O-sarkon, Tiglath, or Takeloth, and I might add Sheshonk also, are neither Assyrian nor Libyan names, but Cushite, or Ethiopian. The Asiatic, or great Tartar-Mongolian race was known to the Egyptians as '*Aam* or Ham. Now, Moses, who uses the Egyptian race names, tells us expressly that Cush (the Babylonians and Ethiopians), and Canaan (the descendants of the Hyksos invaders), were "sons" of this Ham. Wherever the Greeks use the term "Ethiopian," the native monuments have the corresponding Cush, *Kash*, Kashi, Kosse, Kossaeans, etc. The Babylonian kingdom was founded by Nimrod, or Nimroth, who was a "son of Cush," and therefore an Ethiopian. Assur, on the contrary, who went forth from Babylonia and founded the Assyrian kingdom, was a "son of Shem." I can not sufficiently emphasize the important fact that the native Egyptians, the authors of the matchless civilization of ancient Egypt, *were not Hamites*, but belonged to what we now call the "Japhetic" race. Why, I ask, have modern Egyptologists disregarded the clear and definite statements of the Bible respecting the race of Sheshonk I and Osarkon II? The army of the first was composed mostly of Ethiopians and Libyans, while the second is expressly called "the Ethiopian," and his army "Ethiopians." We are told that the Queen of Sheba (called Queen of Egypt and Ethiopia" by Josephus), having heard of the fame of Solomon, came to Jerusalem with a great train and camels that carried spices, and an immense quantity of gold and precious stones. The camels and spices

brought by the queen point to Arabia and the land of *Puon-et* as her home, and yet Josephus must have found some authority for describing her as "Queen of Egypt and Ethiopia."

A long inscription, dated in the twenty-first year of *Pi-anchi*, king of Ethiopia, shows that during the reign of Osorkon, the second king of the Twenty-third Dynasty, that is, about 749 B. C., Lower Egypt had long been a dependency of Ethiopia. The greater part of Upper Egypt had been incorporated in the Ethiopian kingdom. Lower Egypt was governed by numerous petty kings and rulers, all of whom were subject to *Pi-anchi*. Now there is nothing in the lists to indicate that Egypt was subject to Ethiopia at this time, and the fact was unknown until the inscription of *Pianchi*, recently discovered, revealed it. Notwithstanding the length and explicitness of the inscription, it contains no allusion to an Ethiopian conquest of Egypt, showing that it occurred long before the beginning of *Pi-anchi's* reign. It must have occurred at the end of the Twentieth Dynasty. The banishment of thousands of Thebans to the Great Oasis was the result of the fall of the great line of the Ramessids.

We have seen that Menophthah retired to Ethiopia, and that the king of Ethiopia placed a great army at the border of Egypt to protect the voluntary exiles. It thus appears that as early as 1488 B. C. Ethiopia had grown to be more powerful than Egypt. The government was patterned after that of Egypt, and *Pianchi* manifested himself as a devout worshiper

of the Egyptian divinities, notably of Amen. The fact that the kings of the Twenty-first Dynasty erected monuments and inscribed their names and titles in Thebes and other cities in Egypt is not inconsistent with Ethiopian domination. On the contrary, the exceptional fact that they generally entitled themselves "First Priest of Amen," instead of "King of Egypt," demonstrates that they were tributary to some higher power. The civilization of Ethiopia was altogether Egyptian. The names and titles of *Pi-anchi*, the Ethiopian, differ in no respect from those of a full-fledged Pharaoh; his name *Pi-anchi*, "Living One," is pure Egyptian, and he honors in the most impressive manner the so-called gods of Egypt, but particularly Amen of Thebes. It is undeniable that the Thebaid had become an integral part of his kingdom. Lower Egypt and the Heptanomis were parceled out among numerous petty rulers, who, although locally independent, were tributary to the great king of Ethiopia. Thus there could not have been any radical cause for enmity, or antagonism, between the Ethiopians and Egyptians such as that which existed between the latter and the Assyrians.

From the earliest times the Egyptians recruited their fighting men from among the *Masai*, who anciently inhabited the region afterwards known as Nubia. The name for soldier, down to the Coptic, was "Matoi" or *Masai*. After the *Masai* had been supplanted by the Cushites, who seem to have crossed over from the shores of the Red Sea to the upper Nile valley, the army was made up of Ethiopians and



Libyans. At first these troops were drilled and officered by native Egyptians, but, under the weak and effeminate kings of the Twenty-first Dynasty, Ethiopians were intrusted with these positions. Thus the grandfather of Sheshonk I bore the title of *Ur-oâ en mat*, "Great Prince of the Matoi," *mat*, in my opinion, being an abbreviation of "matoi," *mazai*, as long ago demonstrated by E. de Ronge. In the Twenty-first Dynasty the office of *Ur-oâ* seems to have been more important than that of nominal king at Tanis or high-priest of Amen. It was the universal custom at this time to govern conquered countries through native kings. Under Pianchi we find *Tef-necht*, king of Memphis and Sais, Osarkon, king of Tanis, etc. Under Shabakon we find Zet, the priest of Ptah, as local king, etc. Under the Assyrians Nechao and others appear as kings. Why should not the kings of the Twenty-first Dynasty have been subject to the great ruler of the Cushites? The Cushite kings of the Twenty-second Dynasty, by reason of their nationality, enjoyed greater independence, and were allowed to exercise the authority of kings in Egypt, for we can hardly assume that they themselves were the Ethiopian sovereigns. The Israelites of the days of King Asa knew the difference between Egyptians and Cushites. The description of Zarach, or Osarkon II, as "King of Ethiopia" and "the Ethiopian" must be regarded as decisive until positive negative proof is produced.

The army of Zarah, like that of Shishak, was composed of Ethiopians and Libyians; but if he was the

king of an imaginary kingdom of Ethiopia situated somewhere in the desert wastes of Arabia, how could we account for the Libyan contingent of his army?

Egypt separated Libya from Arabia, and a powerful kingdom in Egypt, under Osarkon II, who reigned at Bubastis, made it impossible for an Arabian king to have an army of Libyans. We know from the inscriptions and representations placed on the walls of the Temple of Karnak by Sheshonk I, that he was the Shishak of the Bible. Now, as the armies of Shishak and Zarah were each composed of "Libyans and Ethiopians," we are forced to the conclusion that Zarah was Osarkon II.

Before he became king, Sheshonk I was the *Ur-oâ* of this army of Libyan and Ethiopian mercenaries.

There seems to be a consensus of opinion among Egyptologists that the title Pharaoh is derived from *Per-oâ*, "Great House." In fact, in the celebrated treaty between Ramesses II, king of Egypt, and *Cheta-sar*, king of the Hittites (Land of Cheta), we find the following use of the title:

*"Mutet en pa a-nu en het er-da-en Ur-oâ en Cheta, Cheta-sar, an-et-u er Per-oâ, anch, uza, seneb,"* etc., that is, "Copy of the tablet of silver which the Great Prince of Cheta, Chetasar, caused to be brought to Pharaoh—life, prosperity, and health to him," etc. Here *Per-oâ* (I have written it in the singular, although in the original it is dual) is applied to the king personally, as evidenced by the formula wishing him life, health, and prosperity. Now Pharaoh seems to be a fair transcription of *Perao*, as pro-

nounced in Lower Egypt, where P, almost invariably, became Ph. But in this same treaty the king of the Hittites is called *pa Ur-oâ*, "the Great Prince." *Ur* is great in the sense of primitive—compare *ur-wald* "primeval forest"—*oâ*, in this combination, is an adjective meaning "great;" hence Brugsch's translation, "Great Prince," is correct.

It is significant that, prior to the Twenty-second Dynasty, foreign kings only were called *ur-oâ*, or, with the definite article, *pa ur-oâ*. The Coptic for king is "Ero," "Uro" (*ur-oâ*), and in the Lower Egyptian dialect, Pa-ero, Pa-uro, would become Pha-uro.

During the Twenty-first Dynasty the commander, or general, of the army, which was composed principally of Libyan and Ethiopian mercenaries, bore the distinguished title *Ur-oâ*, *Ur-oâ en Mashuasha*, or *Ur-oâ en mat*, that is, "Great Prince of the Maxyes," etc. Thus Sheshonk, the grandfather of Sheshonk I, held the office of *Ur-oâ*, or Commander of the army. It might be said that he was "*the* Ur-oa," or Pharaoh, and, in fact, he was so powerful and influential that *Meht-en-usech*, the daughter of the king of Egypt, was bestowed upon him in marriage. Nimroth (Nimrod), the son of this union, was buried with regal honors at Abydos.

The office of *Ur-oâ* was hereditary, for the ancestors of Sheshonk I, who founded the Twenty-second Dynasty, held it for five or six generations. Now, if Pharaoh is derived from Pha-ur-oa, then Sheshonk I was the first king of Egypt who ever bore this title. Josephus (Antiq. VIII, 6, 2) tells us that "Pharaoh

in the Egyptian tongue, signifies a king," and undertakes, in a mystical and incomprehensive manner, to explain why all the kings of Egypt, from Menes, who built Memphis, until Solomon, were called Pharaohs, and yet took the name from one Pharaoh that lived after the kings of that interval. He closes the pretended explanation with these words: "As for myself, I have discovered from our own books that after Pharaoh, the father-in-law of Solomon, no other king of Egypt did any longer use that name; . . . but I have now made mention of these things that I may prove that our books and those of the Egyptians agree together in many things."

Josephus confessed in another place that he could not understand the Egyptian language; hence the books of the Egyptians referred to were Manetho's History, which was published in Greek. Is it not evident that Josephus found some mention of the title *Pa-ur-oâ* in his copy of, or extract from, Manetho, and of the fact that Sheshonk I, the successor of Psusanos II, who was Solomon's father-in law, was the first king of Egypt who bore the title? Why then does he endeavor to mystify the facts? In which of the sacred books of the Israelites did he discover that, after Pharaoh, the father-in-law of Solomon, no other king of Egypt used that name? Why did he consider it necessary to explain how all the kings prior to Solomon came to bear a title which was first borne by Sheshonk I. if he had not discovered the statement of the fact in the books of the Egyptians? Must we not infer that Manetho derived

Pharaoh from Pha-ur-o, and explained that it meant "The King?" But it would carry me beyond the limits of this work to pursue the interesting subject farther.

### TWENTY-THIRD DYNASTY OF THREE TANITE KINGS

The Twenty-third Dynasty of three Tanite kings, according to the List of Africanus, omitting the reign of Zet, or Saïtes, which belongs to the Twenty-fourth Dynasty, was as follows:

| Africanus.           |          | Eusebius.            |          |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
| 1. Petubastis, . . . | 40 years | 1. Petubastis, . . . | 25 years |
| 2. Osorchon, . . .   | 8 "      | 2. Osorthon, . . .   | 9 "      |
| 3. Psammus, . . .    | 10 "     | 3. Psammus, . . .    | 10 "     |
| Total, . . . . 59 "  |          | Total, . . . . 44 "  |          |

A fourth king, Zet, with thirty-four or thirty-one years, has been added to the List of Africanus, and the total increased from fifty-nine to eighty-nine years. We have already called attention to the fact that the list used by Eusebius had been changed by the early Christian chronographers, who saw fit to insert epoch-reigns in the place of actual reigns. Thus Petsibastis, the first king of this dynasty, in whose reign (789 to 749 B. C.) the first Olympiad was celebrated (776 B. C.), reigned forty years. Eusebius has Petubastis with twenty-five years, which is the epoch-reign of Osorkon II, in the place of Petsibastis (*Pa-tu-sa-bastit*, "The Gift of the Son of Bast"), and omits the synchronism between his reign and the first Olympiad. Again Osorthon, "whom the Egyptians call Herakles," with nine years, is plainly and

unmistakably the first part of the reign of Osorkon II *Sa-hus-it*, the nine years in the month of Athyr. Of course, the petty king Osorkon, of the Twenty-third Dynasty, who governed a district or two in the Delta at the pleasure of *Pi-anchi*, the Ethiopian king, was not called Herakles by the Egyptians nor Manetho either. When, on the first day of Choiahk, 964 B. C., of the Sothiac year, Horus crossed the equator to become the "Powerful Bull" (*ka-necht*), Manetho compared him, not Osorkon II, to the Grecian Herakles. Here again we see that Egyptian science was cosmic, and that the Sothiac symbols and terminology were based upon natural phenomena affecting our globe as an entirety, and not Egypt alone.

Thus, when Horus crossed the equator at the vernal equinox, he was regarded as the generator of vegetable life in the upper hemisphere. Hence we find such symbols as *Bastit*, originally a vegetable offering, and *Min*, or Pan, the symbols or symbolical personations of the generative principle in nature, presiding over the month of Choiahk. The remark identifying Osorchon III with the Egyptian Hercules, that is, the "Powerful Bull," was not originally in the List of Africanus, but was afterwards inserted there from the List of Eusebius, most probably by Syncellus himself. Manetho's numbers place the beginning of this dynasty at 789 B. C.; consequently Petsibastis became petty king at Tanis thirteen years before the first Olympiad. Manetho's synchronism, therefore, is sustained by the well-known date of the first Olympiad.

We have seen that there is nothing in the great inscription of Pianchi to even indicate that the numerous petty kings and rulers named therein had been appointed or set up by him. The long reign of Petsibastis excludes the supposition that he was appointed petty king by Pianchi. The expedition commemorated in the inscription took place in the twenty-first year of Pianchi; and placing it as far back in the reign of Osorchon III as we possibly can, to wit, in his first year, Petsibastis had been on the throne at least twenty years when Pianchi became king. Now, if Pianchi had conquered Egypt, he would not have permitted his opponent, Petsibastis, previous king of Egypt, to retain the kingdom. On the contrary, the Ethiopian kings gradually, but surely, circumscribed and cut down the powers of the Egyptian kings. In the Twenty-first Dynasty we find native Egyptian kings officiating as high-priests (*top-hon-nuter*) of Amen in Thebes, the army, however, being under the control of Cushite officers, like Sheshonk and Nimroth, bearing the semi-royal title *Ur-oâ*. In the Twenty-second Dynasty we find Egypt governed by Cushite kings, whose only title to the throne was derived from the Egyptian princess *Meht-en-usech*.

We do not know how many native princes were allowed to rule under these, but the Apis-memorials show that even as far north as Memphis itself Cushites exercised the highest priestly functions. In the reign of Pianchi, Upper Egypt, from the land of Cush to the Heptanomis, had become a part of the Ethiopian kingdom, and was governed by the two

commanders of the Ethiopian troops, Paurma and Lamiskeni.

Although Manetho recognized Petsibastis as the legitimate king of Egypt, there can be no doubt that the district actually governed by him was as limited as that ruled over by his successor, Osorchon III. The inscription of Pianchi is too lengthy to insert in this work, and we will content ourselves with brief extracts from it. The reader will find an excellent translation of the entire document in the last edition of Brugsch's History of Egypt.

"Messengers came to inform the king that the lord of the west country, the great prince of the holy city Sais, *Tefnecht*, had established himself in the nome of . . . in the city of Xoïs, in the city of Nilopolis, in the city of . . . in the city of Ain, in the city of *Panub* (Canopus), and in the city of Memphis. He has taken possession of the whole west country, from the Mediterranean coast up to the boundary city. He is advancing up the river with many warriors. The inhabitants of both parts of Egypt have joined themselves to him. The princes and lords of the city are like dogs at his feet."

This *Tefnecht*, who is also called king of Sais and Memphis, is certainly the Tephnachthis of Diodorus, who was the father of Bokchoris. The real name of the latter was Zet, the Sethon of Herodotus. The last king of the Twenty-third Dynasty was Psammus, whose reign of ten years came to an end 730 B. C. This year marks the accession of Shabakon, the Ethiopian, as lord of Egypt, and we can now explain

why Manetho introduced a new dynasty at this point.

As *Tefnecht* was king of Sais and Memphis, lord of the west country, prophet of Neith, and the high-priest of Ptah, his son Zet, Sethon or Bokchoris, certainly inherited the same offices. As there was no connection between Osorchon III of Tanis and *Tefnecht* of Sais and Memphis, the accession of Zet, under Shabakon, introduced a new dynasty.

*Tefnecht* invested the city of Heracleopolis Magna. He let all the princes who acknowledged his power abide every one in his own district, as princes and kings of the cities. Nimrod, the king of Hermopolis, after first demolishing his fortress, to prevent it from falling into the hands of *Tefnecht*, changed his mind, threw himself at the feet of *Tefnecht*, and renounced his allegiance to Pianchi.

When Pianchi received this message, he sent orders to the princes and the two generals of the army above named, who were set over the land of Egypt, to hasten to prevent the rebels from arming, and to invest and blockade the city of Hermopolis, and to fight against it without ceasing. Pianchi then sent his warriors to Egypt, enjoining upon them to be careful, to avoid the enjoyment of play, and to confess that Amen sent them. "The man who despises him shall have no strength; he makes the weak strong, and however many there may be of the strong, they must fly before the weak."

The troops, however, prostrated themselves before Pianchi, claiming that it was *his* name that made them strong, *his* wisdom that gave them firmness.

"Does not thy power give us strength and courage? Who is like unto thee? Thou art the king whose hands create victory, a master in the work of war." Thus we see that Pianchi, notwithstanding his piety, enjoyed the reputation of being a great leader upon the field of battle. A great monarch, in the twenty-first year of his reign, might ordinarily expect to end his days in peace, far from the horrors and alarms of the battle-field, but it is evident that the veterans who had been led to victory by the aged king in his younger days, placed more reliance upon his tried generalship than upon the religious ceremonies they were to go through at Thebes. With all deference to the fealty of the soldiers, we can not help admiring the faith of the aged monarch who bore the name of "The Living One."

### **TWENTY-FOURTH DYNASTY OF FOUR SAITE KINGS**

As we know from Eusebius, Manetho placed the Saite and Ethiopian kings in parallel dynasties. Originally they stood thus:

| <b>Twenty-fourth Dynasty of<br/>Saite Kings.</b> | <b>Twenty-fifth Dynasty of<br/>Ethiopian Kings.</b> |
|--|---|
| 1. Zet, or Bocchoris, 44 years                   | 1. Sabakon, . . . 8 years                           |
| 2. Tephnachte, . . . 7 "                         | 2. Sebichos, . . . 14 "                             |
| 3. Nechepsos, . . . 6 "                          | 3. Tarakos, . . . 18 "                              |
| 4. Nechau I, . . . 8 "                           | 4. Tarakos, King of<br>Upper Egypt, 25 "            |
| <hr/> Total, . . . . 65 "                        | <hr/> Total, . . . . 65 "                           |

In the present lists these dynasties were first entered as consecutive, instead of parallel, and then cut down, until now they are hardly recognizable.

We have already seen that in the Lists of Africanus Zet was added to the Twenty-third Dynasty, and his forty-four years cut down to thirty-four and thirty-one. The Twenty-fourth Dynasty was reduced to one king and six years. To understand how this was done we must observe the division of Zet's reign by the epoch of Am-hir (Mechir) 724 B. C.

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| End of Twenty-second Dynasty, . . . . .            | 730 B. C. |
| Zet, or Sethon, before epoch, . . . . .            | 6         |
| Epoch of <i>Amhir</i> , . . . . .                  | 724 B. C. |
| Zet, or Sethon, after epoch, as "Rokchoris," . . . | 38        |
| End of Zet's reign, . . . . .                      | 686 B. C. |

We now find: "Twenty-fourth Dynasty (number of kings omitted.) Bokchoris Saites (Set?), six years."

One king alone can not constitute a dynasty. Besides, the customary total is also wanting. The List of Eusebius is like the above, except that Bokchoris Saites has forty-four years, followed by "total forty-four years."

No. 74 of the pseudo-Sothis List is "Bokchoris," with forty-four years; No. 78, "Amaes," with thirty-eight years. At the head of his dynasty Eusebius has "Ammeris" (Ameris-*Am-hir-i*), with eighteen years. Bokchoris, therefore, represents *Rohk-ur-i*, or Rokchoris, with the six years of Zet's reign before the epoch, while Amaes, or Ammeris, represents Amiris, with the thirty-eight years of Zet's reign after the epoch. It has been supposed that Zet's name was inserted in the List of Africanus from Herodotus;

but this is an error, for Manetho certainly had him at the head of this dynasty of four Saite kings.

Herodotus introduces this petty king, whom he calls Sethon, as the "priest of Vulcan." We learn from Diodorus that this king, by him called Bokchoris, was the son of *Tef-necht*, who was also the priest of Ptah. In the list of titles given to him in Pianchi's inscription, the first is "King of Sais," which city was his residence. We have just seen that the insurrection led by *Tef-necht* was unsuccessful, but it is evident that he was more powerful and influential than his contemporary, Osorkon III, whom Manetho recognized as the legitimate king. Bokchoris enjoyed a vague reputation for wisdom, although it was impossible to tell upon what it was founded, while his true personality was hidden under the epoch-title Rokchoris. Now, since we know who this king really was, it is evident that the providential destruction of the army of Sennacherib before Pelusium, commemorated by the celebrated statue of Zet in the temple of Ptah, lay at the bottom of it. The successor to this king was also named *Tef-necht*, which confirms the statement of Diodorus, for the kings often named their sons after their grandfathers.

A remark attached to the reign of Sabakon informs us that he took Bokchoris captive and burned him alive. This is the most instructive and amusing of the many errors which were made by the redactors of Manetho's Lists. The accession of Sabakon as king of Egypt took place in 730 B. C., and as Zet's reign begins at the same time, it follows that he was

appointed as under-king by Sabakon himself. After he had reigned six years, the epoch of *Emhir* came in. This month was one of the "Twins," and was called *Rohk-ur*, or "great heat."

Manetho certainly mentioned the epoch (724 B. C.) which fell in the seventh year of Zet's reign, and explained the meaning and derivation of the epoch-titles *Rohk-ur-i* and *Am-hir-i*.

*Rohk-ur-i* led to the fable of Rokchoris (not Zet) being burnt (combussit) alive. Certain it is that Rokchoris reigned thirty-eight years after this "great burning," and that the priests of Sais consulted by Herodotus knew nothing about it. The mention of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, affords us a very important synchronism. We know from the "Canon of Ptolemy," which is astronomically absolute, that this king mounted the throne 704 B. C. Josephus, in treating of the destruction of Sennacherib's army, before Pelusium, tells us that Sennacherib heard that Taraka, king of Ethiopia, was approaching across the desert with a large army. Now Sabakon's reign as king of Egypt closed 722 B. C., about the time Samaria was captured by Shalmaneser, while the reign of Sebichos as king of Egypt closed 708 B. C. Taraka was king of all Egypt from 708 B. C. to 690 B. C., when he was defeated and driven out of Lower Egypt by the Assyrians, although he was recognized as king of Upper Egypt for twenty-five years longer, that is, from 690 B. C. to 665 B. C. Sennacherib reigned from 704 B. C. to 680 B. C., so that his reign and the reign of Zet were contemporary for eighteen years.

The confusion in which modern Egyptologists find themselves involved as to these Ethiopian kings is owing, in part, to the present condition of the lists, which place these kings between Bokchoris and Tephnachtis, and in part to their failure to take into consideration the well-known fact that Manetho's Lists contain kings of *Egypt*, not of Ethiopia.

Psammetichos I, ignoring the Assyrians and the petty kings established by them, claimed to be the successor of Taraka, king of Upper Egypt. An Apis-tablet, heretofore misunderstood, dated in the twentieth year of Psammetichos I, commemorates the death and burial of an Apis-bull born in the twenty-sixth year of the king of *Upper* Egypt, Taraka, and proves that the latter continued to reign as king of Upper Egypt twenty-five years after he had been expelled from Lower Egypt by the Assyrians.

The distinction is a fine one, but Manetho did not recognize any one as "king of Egypt" unless he held, or asserted a potential right to, Memphis, the ancient capital. Now as Tephnachtis, Nechepsos, and Nechao I were princes of Sais and Memphis, just as Zet had been, Manetho recognized them as the legitimate kings, and he was warranted in doing this; for, as we have just seen, Psammetichos I was careful to mention Taraka as king of *Upper* Egypt only. An exceptionally favorable correlation of dates and events enables me to fix the date of the accession of Hosea, king of Israel, at 730 B. C., or the beginning of Manetho's Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Dynasties. By the aid of the "Canon of Ptolemy" we

find that Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, reigned from 726 to 721 B. C. It will be seen that Shalmaneser began to reign in the fifth year of Hosea. We will assume that it was in this year that Shalmaneser came up, and Hosea became his servant, and paid him tribute. After this, Hosea sent messengers to Sabakon, the king of Egypt, that he might not pay tribute to the king of the Assyrians. When Shalmaneser learned that Hosea was endeavoring to rebel, he besieged him, bound him, and cast him into prison; and going up to Samaria, he besieged it three years. And in the ninth year of Hosea he took Samaria, and carried the Israelites away to Assyria, and placed them in Medea. This catastrophe took place about 722 B. C., or one year before the accession of Sarkon. This may be in the nature of an agreeable surprise to those Assyriologists who have concluded that it was not Shalmaneser, but Sarkon, who captured Samaria. These synchronisms, when supported by absolute dates like those found in the "Canon of Ptolemy," are crucial tests when applied to the system of chronology transmitted to us by Manetho. In this instance the conditions are critical; for Sabakon's reign extended from 730 B. C. to 722 B. C., leaving a very small margin indeed. Shalmaneser mounted the throne 726 B. C., or four years only before the end of Sabakon's reign; and when we take into consideration that the siege of Samaria lasted two or three years, we find that Hosea sent his messengers to Sabakon about 724 B. C. According to Manetho, Sabakon was king of Egypt in this year,

and his system bears this test, just as it does every other. Although *Shabaka*, the king of Egypt, did not come to the assistance of Hosea when Samaria was taken by Shalmaneser, his son *Shabataka* formed a league with the Philistines, and measured arms with Sarkona, the successor of Shalmaneser on the throne of Assyria, a few years afterwards. Manetho calls *Shabataka* "Sebichos," dropping the "*ta*," which is the Cushite word for "son." The Hebrews and Assyrians also dropped the definite article "*ka*," reducing the name to *Shaba*, or Sheba, "Male Cat."

Rawlinson, in his excellent History of Assyria, tells us that Sarkon, having crushed the rebellion in Syria, turned his arms to the extreme south, and attacked Gaza, which had been a dependency of Egypt. In consequence of this provocation, Sebichos, called Sibahe or Sebake in the annals of Sarkon, advanced towards Gaza, and joined forces with the Philistines. The warlike Assyrian monarch did not await the attack of the Tartan, or Sultan, of Egypt, as he is called in the annals, but advanced and met him at Raphia, the modern Rafah, about midway between Gaza and the Wady-el-Arish, or "River of Egypt." Here, on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, the contending forces of the two greatest nations of the world met on the field of battle to decide the future destiny of Egypt. This was in the year of 719 B. C., three years after the accession of Sebichos, but more than 3,500 years after Menes, the first king, had founded the glorious kingdom of Upper and Lower Egypt, and built the great Temple of Ptah at Mem-

phis. Alas! Egypt was but a semblance of her former self; the population, once Japhetic, had become largely Cushite, with an additional mixture of Libyan blood, and the native kings and princes were no longer Pharaohs in the true sense of the word, but merely tributary rulers of nomes and districts under the Cushite sovereign, the Sultan of Ethiopia.

The reader can easily anticipate what the result of this battle with the fiercest and most aggressive nation of Asia must have been. Rawlinson expresses it in one sentence:

“Sargon having arrived, immediately engaged the allied army, and succeeded in defeating it completely, capturing Khanun, king of Gaza, and forcing Shebek to seek safety in flight.”

We are told that Samaria was taken in the sixth year of Hezekiah, and that in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, or only eight years thereafter, Sennacherib, king of the Assyrians, came up against the fenced cities of Judah, and took them, whereupon Hezekiah sent messengers to the king of the Assyrians, to Lachis, offering submission, and Sennacherib put a tax upon him of thirty talents of gold and three hundred talents of silver. Instead of the fourteenth, we must read the twenty-seventh year. The long reign of Sarkon comes between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib, so that the latter did not mount the throne as king of the Assyrians until 704 B. C. George Smith, in his *Assyrian Discoveries*, pages 296-308, gives an excellent translation of an inscrip-

tion of this monarch engraved on a cylinder discovered by him. The portion referring to this expedition reads:

"In my third expedition I went to the land of the Hittites. . . . The priests, princes, and people of Ekron placed Padi their king, who was faithful and steadfast to Assyria, in bonds of iron, and gave him to Hezekiah, king of Judah, as an enemy; their hearts feared for the evil they had done. The kings of Egypt, and the archers, chariots, and horses of the king of Ethiopia, gathered a force without number, and came to their help.

"In the vicinity of Eltekeh, their lines were placed before me, and they urged on their soldiers. In the service of Assur, my Lord, I fought with them, and their overthrow I accomplished. Alive in the midst of battle, my hand captured the charioteers and sons of the kings of Egypt, and the charioteers of the king of Ethiopia. I besieged and captured Eltekeh and Timnah, and carried off their spoil. . . .

"And Hezekiah, of Judah, who did not submit to my yoke, forty-six of his strong cities and fortresses, and small cities which were around them, which were without number, with the marching of a host and surrounding of a multitude, with attack of ranks, force of battering-rams, mining, and missiles, I besieged and captured 200,150 people, small and great, male and female, and horses, mules, asses, camels, oxen, and sheep, which were without number. I brought out from the midst of them, and counted as spoil. I had made him like a caged bird within Jerusalem, his royal city; I raised towers around him, and shut the exit of the great gate of his city, and he was conquered. . . .

"The fear of the might of my dominion over-

whelmed Hezekiah and the Urbi and his good soldiers, whom he had caused to enter into Jerusalem to be preserved, and they inclined to submission, with thirty talents of gold, eight hundred talents of silver, precious carbuncles, etc. . . .

“And he sent his daughters, the eunuchs of his palace, male musicians and female musicians, to the midst of Nineveh, the city of my dominion, after me, and he sent his messenger to give tribute and make submission.”

Now, as Sennacherib ascended the throne 704 B. C., and this was his third expedition, the events here recorded could not have taken place earlier than 702 B. C., or the twenty-sixth year of Hezekiah. In these accounts, each nation endeavors to present the occurrences in the most favorable light.

Thus the annals of Sennacherib omit any mention of the expedition against Egypt and the terrible disaster before the walls of Pelusium. The Bible account makes the same omission, and leaves us to infer that Sennacherib returned to Nineveh, where he was soon after murdered by his sons, when, in fact, he immediately gathered a powerful army, and marched to the land of Bit-yakin, and continued to reign fully twenty years thereafter. The priests of Egypt made no mention to Herodotus of the great battle of Eltekeh in which the Egyptian and Ethiopian armies were overthrown.

And Josephus, although he professes to quote all the authorities, garbles and confuses the facts more effectually than any of the others. According to 2 Kings xix, 7, 8, 9, 35, 36, 37, the prophecy against

Sennacherib was as follows: "Behold, I will send a spirit upon him, and he shall hear a message, and shall return into his own country." When Rabshakeh returned from Jerusalem he found Sennacherib besieging Libnah. And when the king heard that Taraka, king of the Ethiopians, was coming out to fight with him, "*and was going against him*," he sent messengers to Hezekiah, etc. "And it came to pass that night that an angel of the Lord came, and slew, in the camp of the Assyrians, 185,000. And when he arose early in the morning, he saw all the bodies of the dead. And Sennacherib, king of the Assyrians, departing, went away, and he returned and abode in Nineveh."

- We learn from the above that when Sennacherib heard that Taraka was coming out to fight with him, *he went against him*; but this is omitted in Isaiah xxxvii, 9.

In Chronicles we read: "And the Lord sent an angel, who cut off all the stout men and warriors, and the captains of the army of the king of the Assyrians, and he returned with disgrace into his own country. And when he was come into the house of his god, his sons that came out of his bowels, slew him with the sword." Now would any one suppose, from this condensed account, that Sennacherib had made an expedition to Egypt to intercept Taraka, and was engaged in besieging Pelusium when his army was cut off, or that, after he departed and returned to Nineveh, he continued to reign nearly twenty years longer?

After Anyses, Herodotus tells us, the priest of Vulcan, whose name was Sethon, reigned in Egypt. "He held in no account and despised the military caste of the Egyptians, as not having need of their services; and accordingly, among other indignities, he took away their lands," etc.

"After this, Sennacherib, king of the Arabians and Assyrians, marched a large army against Egypt, whereupon the Egyptian warriors refused to assist him; and the priest, being reduced to a strait, entered the temple, and bewailed before the image the calamities he was in danger of suffering. While he was lamenting sleep fell upon him, and it appeared to him in a vision that the god stood by and encouraged him, assuring him that he would suffer nothing disagreeable in meeting the Arabian army, for he would himself send assistants to him. Confiding in the vision, he took with him such of the Egyptians as were willing to follow him, and encamped in Pelusium, for here is the entrance (into Egypt); but none of the military caste followed him, but tradesmen, mechanics, and sutlers. When they arrived there, a number of field-mice, pouring in upon their enemies, devoured their quivers and their bows, and, moreover, the handles of their shields; so that, on the next day, when they fled bereft of their arms, many of them fell; and to this day a stone statue of this king stands in the temple of Vulcan with a mouse in his hand, and an inscription to the following effect: 'Whoever looks on me, let him revere the gods.' " (Herod. ii, 141.)

Josephus, who knew the historical facts which had served as a basis for the priestly legends, after following the Bible account of Sennacherib's invasion of

Judah down to the payment of the thirty talents of gold and three hundred talents of silver, says: "Accordingly the Assyrian king took it, and yet had no regard to what he promised; but while he himself went to the war against the Egyptians, he left his general, Rabshakeh, and two other of his principal commanders, with great forces, to destroy Jerusalem."

Omitting what follows about the notice to surrender, etc. Josephus, leaving the reader to infer that Sennacherib marched to the border of Egypt, and invested Pelusium, continues:

"The king of Assyria, when he had failed of his treacherous designs against the Egyptians, returned home without success on the following occasion.


"He spent a long time in the siege of Pelusium, and when the banks that he had raised over against the walls were of a great height, and when he was ready to make an immediate assault upon them, but heard that Tirhaka, king of the Ethiopians, was coming and bringing great forces to aid the Egyptians, and was resolved to march through the desert, and so to fall directly upon the Assyrians, this king Sennacherib was disturbed at the news; and, *as I said before* (?), left Pelusium, and returned back without success. Now, concerning this Sennacherib, Herodotus also says, in the second book of his histories, how 'this king came against the Egyptian king, who was the priest of Vulcan, and that, as he was besieging Pelusium, he broke up the siege on the following occasion: This Egyptian priest prayed to God, and God heard his prayer, and sent judgment on the Arabian king.' But in this Herodotus was mistaken when he called this king not king of the

Assyrians, but of the Arabians; for he sayeth that 'a multitude of mice gnawed to pieces, in one night, both the bows and the rest of the armor of the Assyrians, and that it was on that account that the king, when he had no bows left, drew off his army from Pelusium.'

“And Herodotus does indeed give us this history; nay, and Berosus, who wrote of the affairs of Chaldea, makes mention of this King Sennacherib, and that he ruled over the Assyrians, and that he made an expedition against all Asia and Egypt, and says thus:

“ ‘Now when Sennacherib was returning from his Egyptian war to Jerusalem, he found his army under Rabshakah, his general, in danger (by a plague), for God had sent a pestilential distemper upon his army; and, on the very first night of the siege, a hundred fourscore and five thousand, with their captains and generals, were destroyed. So the king was in great dread and in a terrible agony at this calamity, and, being in great fear for his whole army, he fled with the rest of his forces to his own kingdom, and to his city Nineveh; and when he had abode there a little while, he was treacherously assaulted, and died by the hands of his elder sons, Addremmelech and Seraser, and was slain in his own temple, which was called Araske. Now these sons of his were driven away on account of the murder of their father by the citizens, and went into Armenia, while Assarachoddas took the kingdom of Sennacherib. And this proved to be the conclusion of this Assyrian expedition against the people of Jerusalem.’ ”

The battles of Raphia and Eltekah are mentioned in none of these accounts except the Assyrian. The Egyptian priests added the defection of the military caste, and represented Sethon's army as composed ex-



clusively of tradesmen, mechanics, and sutlers, in order to heighten the effect of their story. The priestly redactors of the Jewish annals have entirely omitted all mention of Sennacherib's expedition to Egypt, in order to create the impression that the destruction of his army occurred in Judea. Josephus, however, flatly contradicts 2 Kings xix, 8 and 9, where it is clearly stated that Sennacherib was besieging Libnah when he received the message of the advance of Taraka, king of Ethiopia, and thence went out against him, when he asserts that the king of Assyria was besieging Pelusium at the time, and, being disturbed at the news, left Pelusium, and returned back without success. Note how he quotes Herodotus:

"This Egyptian priest prayed to God, and God heard his prayer, and sent judgment on the Arabian king."

"A multitude of mice gnawed to pieces in one night both the bows and the rest of the armor of the Assyrians, and it was on this account that the king, when he had no bows left, *drew off his army from Pelusium.*"

We see how inaccurate the alleged quotations of Josephus are, and what care and caution must be observed when we come to analyze the alleged quotations from Manetho and Berosus. I regard the occurrence before the walls of Pelusium as the *historical fact* and the natural and direct cause of the tragedy. Migrations of countless numbers of locusts, quails, and field-mice in these desert countries are well-attested natural phenomena.

If a migrating army of field-mice had succeeded in crossing the desert, they must have been almost starved and famished when they providentially reached the camp of the Assyrian army, and it was but natural for them to gnaw and devour all the leather within reach. When the Assyrians discovered the damage that had been wrought in one night, they fled, and, between the pursuing Egyptians and the horrors of the desert they were compelled to retreat through, large numbers of them perished. The report was current that Taraka and the Ethiopian army were coming across the desert, so as to intercept their retreat, and this naturally added to the panic caused by the work of the field-mice.

Rawlinson supposes a second invasion about 699 B. C., during which Sennacherib's army was destroyed; but this supposition is not supported by any evidence, and is contradicted by the Bible account.

## **TWENTY-FIFTH DYNASTY OF ETHIOPIAN KINGS**

We have just seen that the Twenty-fourth Dynasty of Saite kings and Twenty-fifth Dynasty of Ethiopian kings were contemporary. Both dynasties began 730 B. C. and ended 665 B. C., but during the last twenty-five years of this period, to wit, from 690 B. C. to 665 B. C., Taraka was king of Upper Egypt only, for Lower Egypt was subject to the Assyrians. The last four years of the reign of Zet, therefore, were during the Assyrian domination.

The disaster to Sennacherib's army before the

walls of Pelusium served to delay, but could not avert, the complete overthrow of Ethiopian supremacy in Lower Egypt. Sennacherib was the first Assyrian king to cross the desert which separates Egypt from Palestine. As this was near the beginning of his reign, we can assume that, after he had sufficiently recovered from the shock, he returned with another army to wipe out the disgrace which rested upon his standards. The second invasion of Egypt and the defeat of Taraka must have occurred about 690 B. C., because the eighteen years of his reign as king of Egypt came to an end in this year. The spade may yet turn up some long hidden memorial of the first conquest of Egypt by the Assyrians. Who could have guessed that Esarhaddon, the successor of Sennacherib, had made two separate expeditions to Egypt if the fact had not been revealed by cuneiform inscriptions discovered in Assyria?

The first text, translated by George Smith, gives an account of the expedition of Esarhaddon against Taraka about 671 B. C. In his tenth expedition, Esarhaddon set his face toward the country of Makan and Meluha, by which names the Assyrians designated Lower Egypt. (Right here I may remark that the Hamites, who had been domiciled in the Delta before the Flood, carried these names to Babylonia when they founded that kingdom under Nimrod, and bestowed them on the Delta of the Euphrates and Tigris Rivers at the head of the Persian Gulf, and that the Assyrians, who originally migrated from that country, ostentatiously displayed their knowledge of

this fact by adhering to the ancient names.) He collected his powerful army, and went forth from his capital city, Assur, in the first month of Nisan, crossed over the rivers Tigris and Euphrates, and passed through difficult countries like a bull, (*Ka-necht?*) In the course of his expedition, he besieged Baal, king of Tyre, who had intrusted his country to Taraka, king of Cush (Ethiopia), had thrown off the yoke of Assur, and had made defiance. Leaving this city invested, he marched to Raphia, where Sarkon had gained his great victory, crossed the desert, where there was no water, and where his army suffered the greatest hardships, and eventually reached the Delta. The Assyrian authority was re-established over Lower Egypt, and the numerous petty kings, with whom we have become familiar through the celebrated inscription of Pianchi, were accepted as Assyrian feudatories. Unfortunately, the text is fragmentary, and breaks off in the most important parts. Owing to this, we do not know whether Esarhaddon succeeded in his campaign against Thebes and Nubia, where he expected, once for all, to suppress the Ethiopian king. The Assyrian army suffered severely from the nature of the country, and, as far as Taraka was concerned, the expedition was without permanent results. Taraka seems to have remained quiescent during the reign of Esarhaddon, whom he had learned to fear, that is, from 690 B. C. to 667 B. C.; but upon his death, as we learn from the annals of Assurbanipal, he invaded Lower Egypt, overcame the kings and governors whom Esarhaddon had ap-

pointed, despised the power of Assur, Ishtar, and the other great gods of the Assyrians, and trusted to his own might. When Assurbanipal received this news, he was going in state in the midst of Nineveh, and his heart was bitter and much afflicted over these things.

He gathered his powerful forces, which Assur and Ishtar had placed in his hands, and directed his march to Egypt and Ethiopia. Taraka, who was in Memphis, heard of the progress of his expedition, and sent out his army to meet him; but the terror of Assur and Ishtar overcame him, his army was defeated and overthrown; overwhelmed, he abandoned Memphis, and, to save his life, fled to Thebes. Assurbanipal pursued him, and took that city also. He tells us that he restored the kings, prefects, and governors whom his father, Esarhaddon, had appointed, naming twenty of them, among whom we will only mention "Necho, king of Memphis, and Sais," who, according to Manetho, reigned from 673 B. C. to 665 B. C. After doing all this, the Assyrian king returned to Nineveh with abundant plunder and much spoil. But these kings, seeking to rebel, conspired with Taraka, and were about to throw off the Assyrian yoke, when they were arrested and bound hands and feet by the Assyrian generals who had been left in Egypt by Assurbanipal.

Necho, however, found favor in the sight of the king, and was restored to his kingdom; costly garments were placed upon him, ornaments of gold and his royal image made for him, bracelets of gold fast-

ened upon his limbs, and a sword of steel, with a sheath of gold, given him. Assurbanipal sent his generals as governors to assist him, and appointed, for his royal riding, chariots, horses, and mules. The son of Necho was appointed as local governor in Athribis. The Assyrian monarch tells us that he bestowed on Necho benefits and favors far beyond those which his father Esarhaddon had bestowed on him.

“Taraka fled from the place, the might of the soldiers of Assur, my lord, overwhelmed him, and he went to his place of night,” that is, he died.

The great Ethiopian king who had reigned as king of Egypt from 708 B. C. to 690 B. C., and as king of Upper Egypt and Ethiopia from 690 B. C. to 665 B. C., a period of forty-three years, and who had made one of the most heroic defenses of his native land, against overwhelming odds, to be found in the annals of history, a long and determined struggle against fate, seems to have died of a broken heart in extreme old age. Is it a wonder that the name of Taraka has come down to us enveloped in a halo of legend and myth as one of the greatest warriors of antiquity?

After Taraka's death, Undamane (*Rud-amen*), son of Shabaka, ascended the throne. He made the cities of Thebes and Hermopolis his fortresses, gathered his forces, besieged the Assyrians and their tributary kings in Memphis, and took them. A swift messenger conveyed the news to Nineveh.

Assurbanipal tells us that he directed his second

expedition to Egypt and Ethiopia. Undamane heard of the progress of the expedition, and that he had crossed the border of Egypt, and thereupon abandoned Memphis, and fled to Thebes to save his life. The kings, prefects, and governors, whom Assurbanipal had set up in Egypt, came to his presence, and offered their submission.

The Assyrian king pursued Undamane to Thebes, but the Ethiopian, when he saw the powerful army of his enemy, abandoned Thebes, and fled to Kipkip in Ethiopia. The "Great City" was now thoroughly sacked and plundered, and the "spoil great and unnumbered," including two lofty obelisks, covered with beautiful carving, that stood before the gate of a temple, carried off in triumph to Assyria. This catastrophe happened about 665 B. C. At least, Psammetichos, the first king of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, dated his inscriptions from the death of Taraka, king of Upper Egypt, or 665 B. C. In the annals of his third campaign, 664 B. C., Assurbanipal tells us that he went against Baal, king of Tyre, and reduced him to submission. "Gyges, king of Lydia, a district across the sea, a remote place," sent messengers to pray for friendship; but after he had prevailed over the Kimmerians, he hardened his heart, discontinued the messengers, and sent his forces to the aid of Psammetichos, king of Egypt, who had thrown off the Assyrian yoke. As a punishment for this bad faith, the Kimmerians came and swept the whole of his country. Thus Manetho is sustained to the very year by the annals of Assurbanipal, for this

monarch does not appear to have again set foot on the soil of Egypt, but informs us expressly that, at the time of his third expedition, or 664 B. C., Psammetichos had thrown off the yoke, and had become king of Egypt. The dates of the separate reigns can be fixed as follows:

|                               |                             |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Native kings, . . . 730 B. C. | Ethiopians, . . . 730 B. C. |
| Zet, or Rokchoris, . 44       | Shabaka, . . . . . 8        |
| <u>686 B. C.</u>              | <u>722 B. C.</u>            |
| Tephnachtis, . . . 7          | Shabataka, . . . . 14       |
| <u>679 B. C.</u>              | <u>708 B. C.</u>            |
| Nephepsos, . . . . 6          | Taraka, . . . . . 18        |
| <u>673 B. C.</u>              | <u>690 B. C.</u>            |
| Nechao I, . . . . . 8         | Taraka, King of             |
|                               | Upper Egypt, . . 25         |
| <u>665 B. C.</u>              | <u>665 B. C.</u>            |

Thus Hosea was contemporary with Shabaka and Zet. When Sarkon gained his great victory at Raphia, Shabataka, or Sebichos, and Zet were ruling. The defeat of Sennacherib before Pelusium took place while Taraka was king of Egypt, and Zet, petty king of Memphis and Sais. If Egypt was conquered by Sennacherib about 690 B. C., Zet, who was then king of Memphis and Sais, probably transferred his allegiance from Taraka to Sennacherib. Tephnachtis, it seems, was deposed about 679 B. C., and Nechep-sos, in his turn, about 673 B. C. Nechao I was put in his place. We accordingly find the latter mentioned by Assurbanipal about 667 B. C.

The date 665 B. C. for the beginning of the reign

of Psammetichos, thus worked out from the separate reigns and synchronisms, is supported by the astronomical dates of the Egyptians.

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Epoch of Amhir, . . . . .                | 724 B. C. |
| Zet, after epoch, as "Amiris," . . . . . | 38        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 686 B. C. |
| Tephnachtis, . . . . .                   | 7         |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 679 B. C. |
| Nechepsoa, . . . . .                     | 6         |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 673 B. C. |
| Nechao I, . . . . .                      | 8         |
|  | <hr/>     |
| Accession of Psammetichos I, . . . . .   | 665 B. C. |
| Psammetichos I, . . . . .                | 54        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 611 B. C. |
| Nechao I, before epoch, . . . . .        | 7         |
|  | <hr/>     |
| Epoch of Phamenoth, . . . . .            | 604 B. C. |

## TWENTY-SIXTH DYNASTY OF SIX SAITE KINGS

Guided by the star that led the three wise men to Bethlehem, we have safely traversed the unknown sea of ancient chronology, and now we find ourselves upon firm historical ground.

"Thus much of the account the Egyptians and the priests related," says Herodotus at this point, adding: "What things both other men and the Egyptians agree in saying occurred in this country, I shall now proceed to relate, and shall add to them some things of my own observation."

Notwithstanding this promising introduction, the "Father of History" inaugurates his description of this dynasty with an account of the building of the

Labyrinth, which is out of place and anachronistic by nearly 2,000 years.

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Beginning of Twenty-sixth Dynasty, . . . . .       | 665 B. C.       |
| 1. Psammetichos I, . . . . .                       | 54              |
|  | <hr/> 611 B. C. |
| 2. Nechao II, before epoch of Phamenoth, . . . . . | 7               |
| Epoch, . . . . .                                   | 604 B. C.       |
| Nechao II, after epoch, . . . . .                  | 9               |
|  | <hr/> 595 B. C. |
| 3. Psammetichos II, <i>another</i> , . . . . .     | 6               |
|  | <hr/> 589 B. C. |
| 4. Uaphris, . . . . .                              | 19              |
|  | <hr/> 570 B. C. |
| 5. Amosis, . . . . .                               | 44              |
|  | <hr/> 526 B. C. |
| 6. Psammecherites (six months), . . . . .          | I               |
| End of Dynasty, . . . . .                          | 525 B. C.       |

We have purposely given Manetho's List first, so that the reader might more readily see how the division of Necho's reign by the epoch of Phamenoth, 604 B. C., has affected the present lists.

| Africanus.                   | Eusebius.                     |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Psammetichos, . 54 years  | 1. Psammetichos, . 44 years   |
| 2. Nechao II, . . . 6 "      | 2. Nechao II, . . . 6 "       |
| 3. Psammuthis, <i>an-</i>    | 3. Psammuthis, <i>an-</i>     |
| <i>other</i> , . . . . . 6 " | <i>other</i> , . . . . . 17 " |
| 4. Uaphris, . . . . 19 "     | 4. Uaphris, . . . . 25 "      |
| 5. Amosis, . . . . . 44 "    | 5. Amosis, . . . . . 42 "     |
| 6. Psammecherites, ½ "       | 6. Psammecherites, ½ "        |

Nechao II, as we also know from Herodotus, reigned sixteen years; but neither this number nor the seventeen years before the epoch, nor the nine years after it, appear in the above lists. Eusebius

attempted to correct the error, and restore the list, by giving Psammuthis seventeen years, and Uaphris (6+19) twenty-five years. The epoch-title, "Psammuthis," has usurped the place of Psammetichos II, although the word "another," which was used instead of II, remains to identify him. The eighty-third king of the pseudo-Sothis List is "Nechao II Pharaoh," with a reign of nine years, that is, his reign after the epoch. I contend that his entire reign was sixteen years and, at least, six months, whence the seventeen years of Eusebius. This view is sustained by the date of the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses, 525 B. C.; for we need these six months to complete the seventy-nine years between the epoch 604 B. C. and the date of the conquest.

Herodotus gives Psammis (Psamuis?), the successor of Neko, six years; but it seems strange that, as far back as 450 B. C., he should give Uaphris twenty-five instead of nineteen years, an error resulting from this same Sothiac division of Neko's reign.

The history of this dynasty is so well known that I shall merely take up a few points which are closely connected with the chronology of the period, and afford synchronisms by which it can be tested and corroborated. We have seen that the fifty-four years of Psammetichos I began in the third year of Assurbanipal, 665 B. C.

We learn from the annals of Assurbanipal that, when he mounted the throne of Assyria, Gyges was king of Lydia, "a distant and remote country;" and

Herodotus tells us that, during the reign of Ardys, the son and successor of Gyges, the Kimmerians, being driven from their seats by the Skythian nomads, passed into Asia, and possessed themselves of all Sardis except the citadel.

This occupation of Lydia by the Kimmerians is alluded to by Assurbanipal in the account of his third expedition.

He tells us that Gyges, king of Lydia, had received intelligence of his grand kingdom through a dream, and had sent his messenger to pray for Assurbanipal's friendship. "From the midst of the day when he took the yoke of my kingdom, he captured the Kimmerians, wasters of the people of his country, who did not fear my fathers and me, and did not take the yoke of my kingdom."

"His messengers, whom, to pray for my friendship, he was constantly sending, he willfully discontinued, as the will of Assur, my creator, he had disregarded; and he trusted to his own power, and hardened his heart.

"He sent his forces to the aid of Psammetichos, king of Egypt, who had thrown off the yoke of my dominion, and I heard of it, and prayed to Assur and Ishtar thus: 'May they cast his corpse before his enemies, and may they carry his servants captive!' When thus to Assur I had prayed, he requited me, for his corpse was thrown down before his enemies, and they carried his servants captive. The Kimmerians, whom by the glory of my name he had trodden under him, came and swept the whole of his country. After him his son sat on the throne. By the hand of his envoy he sent and took the yoke of my king-

dom, thus: 'The king whom God has blessed, art thou; my father departed from thee, and evil was done in his time; I am thy devoted servant, and my people all perform thy pleasure.' "

This is a remarkable confirmation, in part, of what Herodotus relates, and it is important in fixing the date of these events between 667 and 664 B. C. While a new and unexpected enemy had thus arisen on the western border of Assyria, another, even more formidable, had imperceptibly grown up on the east; and, as if it were providential, all this occurred when Assyria stood at the very pinnacle of her greatness, and no doubt considered herself invincible. Herodotus informs us that Deioces collected the Medes into one nation, and when he died, after reigning fifty-three years, his son Phraortes succeeded him in the kingdom. He first of all attacked the Persians, and reduced them under the dominion of the Medes. Afterward, being master of these two nations, both of them powerful, he subdued Asia, attacking one nation after the other, till, at last, he invaded the Assyrians, who had before been supreme, though at that time they were abandoned by their confederates who had revolted, but who were otherwise in good condition. The first encounter between the Medes and the victorious armies of the Assyrians proved very disastrous to the invaders; for Phraortes, with the greater part of his army, perished miserably after he had reigned twenty-two years. Cyaxares, his son, who is said to have been more warlike than his ancestors, succeeded him. After he had subjected the

whole of Asia above the river Haly, he assembled his forces and marched against Nineveh to avenge his father and destroy that city. He obtained a victory over the Assyrians, and was besieging Nineveh when a great army of Skythians came upon him. This savage horde had driven the Kimmerians out of Europe, and, pursuing them into Asia, entered the territory of the Medes. They passed along the north flank of the Caucasus, and entered Media near the western shore of the Caspian Sea. There the Medes came into an engagement with them; but, being worsted in the battle, the Skythians became masters of all Asia. From thence they proceeded toward Egypt; but when they had reached Palestine in Syria, Psammetichos, king of Egypt, wisely met them with presents and prayers, and diverted them from advancing farther. Returning, they governed Asia for twenty-eight years, and everything was overthrown by their licentiousness; for besides the usual tribute, they exacted from each whatever they chose to impose, and rode around the country plundering the people of all their possessions. After these fateful twenty-eight years, Cyaxares defeated them and recovered his former power, and finally took Nineveh and reduced the Assyrians into subjection, having reigned altogether forty years. (Herod. I, 100 to 106.) I regard the account of Herodotus as strictly historical, and see no reason to doubt that Deioces "collected the Medes into one nation."

His son, Phraortes, succeeded to a powerful and well-organized kingdom, and to assert, as some do,

that the separate tribes of the Medes were not organized into a nation by Deioces is simply to beg the question, for it implies that some one before Deioces did it, a bare assertion without any evidence, probability, or authority to support it.

The defeat and death of Phraortes gives us a fixed point from which we can proceed to determine the relative dates of these events:

| Assyrian.                    | Median.                       |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Sennacherib, . 704-680 B. C. | Deioces, . . . 708-655 B. C.  |
| Esarhaddon, . 680-667 B. C.  | Phraortes, . . 655-633 B. C.  |
| Assurbanipal, 667-626 B. C.  | Cyaxares, . . . 633-593 B. C. |
|                              | Astyages, . . . 593-558 B. C. |
|                              | Cyrus, . . . . 558-529 B. C.  |

The defeat of Phraortes, therefore, occurred in the year 633 B. C., and his opponent was Assurbanipal, one of the greatest warriors that ever ruled over Assyria. We can now see that the repeated raids of the Assyrians into Media, under Sennacherib and Esarhaddon, compelled the Medes to unite for self-preservation, and enabled Deioces to consolidate them into a compact nation. Although the Medes sustained a severe repulse under Phraortes, their recuperative powers were unimpaired, and, to the surprise of the Assyrians, they returned in a few years after 633 B. C. under a more warlike king, and this time the invincible host of the Assyrians, and their proud monarch himself, turned their backs and sought refuge behind the impregnable walls of Nineveh.

While Cyaxares and his Medes were besieging the capital of Assyria (the wicked city which had resounded with the prophetic warnings of Jonah), a

black and destructive storm-cloud suddenly and unexpectedly burst upon the neighboring districts of Media—a savage horde of wild and uncouth barbarians, whose ferocity knew no bounds. Cyaxares immediately raised the siege and hurried back to Media, when his army was defeated and driven back by the invaders. These Skythians were akin to the Huns, Cossacks, and Calmucks of later ages, and belonged to that great destructive, serpent-worshiping race of Ham, which flooded and almost destroyed the civilized world in the year 2348 B. C. These animal-like barbarians, after roaming over the boundless steppes of Eastern Russia for many centuries, were suddenly seized by an irresistible impulse, which impelled them onward like a swarm of locusts, so that, after driving the Kimmerians out of their primeval seats in Europe, they suddenly burst forth from behind the lofty ranges of the Caucasus, and spread over Mesopotamia like a deluge. The Assyrians, who had just escaped from the Medes, were in no condition to meet them or drive them back, and we are bound to assume that the most cruel and bloodthirsty nation of Asia fell an easy victim to a still more cruel and bloodthirsty foe. No account of the devastation of Assyria by this horde has come down to us; but, as their course was westward from Media, they necessarily passed through the rich and luxurious districts of the Assyrians, leaving ruin and desolation in their wake, and we can account for the sudden, utter, and complete collapse of the Assyrian kingdom in no other way.

The Skythians were led by a king called Madyes,

and after they had repulsed the Medes fell upon the opulent cities of Assyria, instead of pursuing the Medes into their mountain fastnesses, where there was little to tempt the cupidity of the barbarians. Placing this invasion at approximately 630 B. C., Psammetichos had been reigning over thirty-five years when he averted the impending danger by meeting the invaders in Palestine, and prevailing upon them with rich presents to advance no farther. In fact, the barbarians do not seem to have been without military tact and discretion, for they were careful to keep their line of communication with Skythia open, and not to advance too far southward, which would have endangered it, and laid them liable to being cut off, hemmed in, and caught in a trap.

It was for this reason also that they did not venture into Babylonia. Madyes was too careful a leader to permit the Lydians, Assyrians, and Medes to unite and take up a commanding position between him and his home in Russia, and therefore maintained the main body of the Skythians in Assyria proper, which was the key to the situation. Herodotus tells us expressly that they governed Asia for twenty-eight years, at the end of which time Cyaxares and the Medes invited the greatest part of them to a feast, and, having made them drunk, put them to death, showing that the greater part of them were stationed near Media, or, as we have just said, in Assyria. Accepting the numbers of Herodotus in preference to imaginary and speculative numbers, we can fix the expulsion of the Skythians at about 602 B. C.

Assyria, which had been crippled and paralyzed in this extraordinary manner, was completely wiped out, and Egypt enjoyed an Indian summer, which was as brilliant and gorgeous as it was brief and delusive. Nechao mounted the throne in the year 611 B. C., under apparently very auspicious conditions, and being vigorous and warlike, he immediately organized a large army, invaded Asia, and took possession of Palestine and Syria to the banks of the Euphrates. It was in the year 609 B. C. that Josiah, the king of Judah, drew up his army at Megiddo, the scene of so many celebrated battles, to oppose the progress of Nechao's army. In vain did Pharaoh assure the Jewish king that he had no hostile intentions against the Jews, but was marching against the Babylonians in obedience to the command of his god. Josiah remained obdurate, was defeated, and lost his life. The exact and complete agreement of all the dates involved at this point are of the deepest significance, because they prove the absolute character of the so-called epoch-reigns, which, being fixed by astronomical observations, must necessarily bear the test. It will be seen that Nechao enlisted and organized this army in the short space of two years. The Manethonian Lists, brief as they are, inform us that he captured Jerusalem and carried away King Jehoahaz. Josephus tells us that Neco, king of Egypt, raised an army and marched to the river Euphrates, in order to fight with the Medes and Babylonians, who had overthrown the dominion of the Assyrians, for he had a desire to rule over Asia. This reference to the Medes

and Babylonians shows that in this instance Josephus followed reliable authorities, for Cyaxares was still reigning over the Medes, although it would be necessary to shorten the dominion of the Skythians over Asia from twenty-eight to about twenty-one years, if the final capture of Nineveh is placed back as far as 609 B. C. As Jehoahaz reigned but three months and ten days, it results that Neco overran and took possession of all the country to the river Euphrates within about three months from the battle of Megiddo. According to the "Canon of Ptolemy," Nebuchadnezzar became king of Babylonia 604 B. C.

A great battle was fought between the Babylonians and the Egyptians at the city of Carchemish on the Euphrates, which resulted in the signal overthrow of the latter, so that Nebuchadnezzar passed over the Euphrates, and took Syria as far as Pelusium. In the defeat of the Egyptian monarch the Jews lost their best friend, for nothing is more evident to the careful student of Egyptian history than the fact that the Egyptians were at all times friendly and well disposed to the Jews, who seem to have been regarded by them as Egyptian colonists. The capture of Jerusalem by Shishak can not be regarded as an exception to this rule, because this king, as we have already shown, was Cushite, and not Japhite. Thus it happened that the king of Babylon first forced the Jews to become tributary, then took their city and carried many of them away as captives to Babylonia, and finally in his nineteenth year—that is, 586 B. C.—burned and destroyed Jerusalem, and carried the rest of the Jews

away into captivity, leaving only a small remnant of the meaner sort to till the land.

Now Uaphris mounted the throne 589 B. C., or three years before the burning of the Temple, and we accordingly find in the Manethonian Lists that this miserable and heartbroken remnant fled to this king to escape from the power of the Babylonians here as elsewhere called Assyrians by Manetho.

The end of this dynasty is properly the end of this little work, because it brings us down to the year 525 B. C., when Cambyses, the king of Persia, conquered Egypt, and placed upon his head the double crown of Upper and Lower Egypt, which had been worn with so much true dignity by such celebrated men and rulers as Menes, Chufu, Amenemes, Thothmes, and Ramesses. O, what a fall was there! The Manethonian Lists show upon their face that Cambyses commenced to reign over Egypt in the fifth year of his reign as king of Persia. According to the Canon of Ptolemy he reigned from 529 to 521 B. C., consequently his fifth year was 525 B. C., and as his reign ended 521 B. C., he heads the Twenty-seventh Dynasty of eight Persian kings with four years. By mistake Cambyses is now credited with six instead of four years in the list of Africanus. Eusebius has a different arrangement. He at first enters Cambyses with three years, dating from his fifth year as king of Persia, and then enters the "Magi" with seven months, the two, in round numbers, filling out the interval of four years between 525 and 521 B. C.

Neither Africanus nor Ptolemy enter these seven months of the "Magi" as a separate reign. With this rectification, Manetho and Ptolemy compare as follows:

| Manetho.                  |          | Ptolemy.                                    |
|---------------------------|----------|---|
| 1. Cambysea, . . . 4      | years    | Cambysea, from<br>fifth year, . . . 4 years |
| 2. Darius, . . . 36       | "        | Darius I, . . . 36 "                        |
| 3. Xerxes, . . . 21       | "        | 3. Xerxes, . . . 21 "                       |
| 4. Artabanoa,             | 7 months |   |
| 5. Artaxerxes,            | 41 years | 5. Artaxerxes I, . . 41 "                   |
| 6. Xerxes, . . . 2 months |          | 6.  |
| 7. Sogdianoa, . . 7       | "        | 7.  |
| 8. Darius, . . . 19       | years    | 8. Darius II, . . . 19 "                    |
| Total, . . . 122          | "        | 121 "                                       |

As Ptolemy omits all reigns below one year, it is evident that the eight years of Cambyses included the seven months of Magi, and was, therefore, slightly in excess of his actual reign, and the extra months were estimated as an additional year in the forty-six years given by Ptolemy to Artaxerxes II. This shows what an important item the extra months and extra days may become, and one should always bear in mind that Manetho himself recorded the separate reigns accurately in years, months, and days, and that the changes to years were made by Africanus and Eusebius. We should also bear in mind that Manetho antedates Ptolemy by several centuries, and that the latter, in preparing his celebrated Canon, used Manetho and Berosus.

Xerxes I commenced to reign 485 B. C., or just

one year before the epoch of Pharmuthi, 484 B. C. Manetho mentioned this fact, showing that after Xerxes had reigned one year he became the epoch-king "Psamuthis"—that is, *P'sa-muth-i*, "the son of Muth." Afterwards "Psamuthis" was mistaken for a separate king, and as there was plainly no place for him in a Persian Dynasty, he was by one set of epitomists transferred to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, and by another to the Twenty-ninth Dynasty, where he appears as "Psammuthis" and "Muthis," with the distinctive one year.

A similar mistake occurred in the Thirtieth Dynasty, where the epoch-title of *Necht-har-heb* (Nektarebes), "Amyrtaios," was supposed to stand for a separate king, and was substituted for the name of the last king of the Twenty-eighth Dynasty, which now appears as follows in the lists: "Twenty-eighth Dynasty, Amyrtaios Saites, six years."

Of course, Manetho's Twenty-eighth Dynasty was composed of the native claimants to the throne during the one hundred and twenty-two years of Persian domination, the last of whom actually reigned six years after the period, or from 403 to 397 B. C. In this way these six years ultimately became separated from the last king of the dynasty, whose entire reign had been first given. Then, as the six years only belonged in the chronological list, the dynasty itself was omitted and lost, and Saites, with six years, and Amyrtaios, with the like number, substituted for it. We have already seen that Zet, or "Saites," reigned six years before the epoch 724 B. C. It remains to

be seen that Nechtarebes reigned six years after the epoch 364 B. C.

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| End of Persian Dynasty, according to Manetho, . . . . . | 403 B. C. |
| Amyrtaios and Saitea, . . . . .                         | 6         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 397 B. C. |
| Nepherites, . . . . .                                   | 6         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 391 B. C. |
| Achoris, . . . . .                                      | 13        |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 378 B. C. |
| Psammuthis, or Muthia, . . . . .                        | 1         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 377 B. C. |
| Nepherites (four months), . . . . .                     | 1         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 376 B. C. |
| Nektarebes, before epoch of Pachona, . . . . .          | 12        |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 364 B. C. |
| Nektarebes, after epoch, as "Amyrtaios," . . . . .      | 6         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 358 B. C. |
| Teos, . . . . .   | 2         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 356 B. C. |
| Nektanebos ( <i>Necht-neb-es</i> ), . . . . .           | 18        |
|   | <hr/>     |
| End of Thirtieth Dynasty, . . . . .                     | 339 B. C. |

We need not repeat here why *Amen-ir-tais*, or "Ammonodotus," was selected as a most appropriate epoch-title for the month of Chons, the son of Amen and Muth, having explained it fully in connection with the epoch 3284 B. C. The discrepancy of one year between 338 and 339 B. C., at the end, is apparent only. Ptolemy places Artaxerxes II at 404 B. C., but gives him an extra year made up of the odd months of his predecessors. We have given this extra year to the Persian Dynasty, which ends with Darius II; but its true duration was one hundred and twenty-two years and four months. Now, here are four extra

months to be taken into consideration; but they are more than overcome by the extra one year of Psammuthis, or Muthis, already included in the twenty-one years of Xerxes I. Thus it is extremely gratifying to find that the separate eras and epochs bring us down to 339 B. C., the exact date required by the grand totals 350 and 3555, beginning respectively at the celebrated era, 4244 B. C., and the equally celebrated date, 3894 B. C.

### **BABYLONIAN AND ASSYRIAN CHRONOLOGY**

Since the Tel-el-Amarna clay-tablets have revealed the fact that Burna-buryas, king of Babylon; Assuruballid, king of Assyria; and *Ach-en-aten*, king of Egypt, were contemporaries, we have a fixed point from which we can proceed to build up and restore the chronology of Babylonia and Assyria.

According to the Mosaic account, Nimrod organized the first great kingdom in the alluvial plains of Babylonia. We are told that he began to be mighty upon the earth. "And the beginning of his kingdom was Babylon, and Erech (Arach), and Accad, and Calneh (Chalanne), in the land of Shinar. Out of that land came forth Assur and builded Nineveh and the streets of the city, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah: this is the great city." Now the above, coming from such an authority, carries with it great weight, and deserves much consideration. It shows, beyond question, that Babylonian

and Assyrian chronology can not be carried back beyond the date of the Flood, or 2348 B. C.

We have already demonstrated that Ham, the son of Noah, represents the government established by resident Hamites in the Delta, about 2448 B. C. After the great *'Aamu* invasion of Western Asia and Egypt, in the year 2348 B. C., these Egyptian Hamites, who had learned the art of government in Egypt, organized kingdoms in Babylonia, which were modeled after the kingdom of Upper and Lower Egypt as it existed under the kings of the Sixteenth Dynasty. The sons of this Ham were Cush, or the Kashi of Elam and Babylonia; Mizraim, or the Hyksos; Phut, or the Libyans; and Canaan. Here Cush, the first named, represents the first government established in Babylonia, which, however, must have been tributary to the Elamite tyrants mentioned by Berosos. The birth of Cush can be fixed provisionally at 2348 B. C., and would correspond with the eight Median tyrants mentioned by Berosus.

Nimrod, the son of Cush, marks a government derived from this Cushite government, limited to Babylonia, and distinct from Elam, the beginning of which may be placed provisionally at 2124 B. C. The all-important fact, however, is that Moses placed all of these sons of Ham, without exception, after the Flood.

The Babylonians themselves did not pretend to have any authentic history beyond the Elamite conquest. The eighty-six kings who now appear before

the Median ('*Aamu*, Elamite) invasion of 2348 B. C. are plainly mythological (unless they are the seventy-six kings of Manetho's "main line" before this date), just as the total of 24,080 years, allotted to them by Eusebius, is certainly a slightly changed Sothiac number. This total was made up as follows:

|   |       |              |
|---|-------|--------------|
| Twenty-two Sothiac cycles before the era        |       |              |
| 2784 B. C., . . . . .                           |       | 32,142 years |
| Interval between 2784 B. C. and 2348 B. C., 436 |       |              |
| First Dynasty, eight Median kings, . . .        | 224   |              |
| Second Dynasty, eleven Median kings, . .        | 48(?) |              |
| Third Dynasty, forty-nine Babylonian            |       |              |
| kings, . . . . .                                | 458   |              |
| Fourth Dynasty, nine Arabian kings, . .         | 245   |              |
| Fifth Dynasty, forty Babylonian kings, .        | 526   |              |
| One extra Sothiac year, . . . . .               | I     | 1,938 "      |
| Total, . . . . .                                |       | 34,080 "     |

Now, as we shall see, this total, as set down by Berosus, was 34,180, and reached down to the era of Nabonassar, 747 B. C., the deficiency of one hundred years being due to an error in the total of the Second Dynasty, which was one hundred and forty-eight, instead of forty-eight, years. After this mistake was made the separate sums footed up 34,080 only, instead of the required 34,180. Berosus evidently treated the ten dynasties before the Flood, including Xisuthrus, or Noah, as mythological, for he assigned to them astronomical periods, instead of historical numbers. By going back sufficiently far in the Great Year of twenty-five Sothiac cycles, or 36,525 Sothiac years, for his mythological beginning point, he was able to fix the beginning of his first historical dynasty of eight Median tyrants—that is, Elamite kings—at

2348 B. C., and to connect accurately with the established era in Babylonia, to wit, the era of Nabonassar, 747 B. C. In this way the system became self-verifying.

For illustration, take twenty-three Sothiac cycles prior to the Sothiac era 1324 B. C., which give us  $(1461 \times 23)$  33,603 years, and add to this sum the 577 years between the era 1324 B. C. and the era 747 B. C., and we obtain the 34,180 years of Berosus.

In his celebrated treatise against Apion, Josephus says concerning Berosus (Book I, ch. 19):

"I will now relate what has been written concerning us in the Chaldean histories: which records have a great agreement with our books in other things also. Berosus shall be witness to what I say: he was by birth a Chaldean, well known by the learned on account of his publication of the Chaldean books of astronomy and philosophy among the Greeks. This Berosus, therefore, following the most ancient records of that nation, gives us a history of the deluge of waters that then happened, and of the destruction of mankind thereby, and agrees with Moses' narration thereof. He also gives us an account of that ark wherein Noah, the origin of our race, was preserved when it was brought to the highest part of the Armenian Mountains: after which he gives us a catalogue of the posterity of Noah, and adds the years of their chronology, and at length comes down to Nabonassar, who was king of Babylon and of the Chaldeans."

Thus it is certain that Berosus traced his history and chronology through Egyptian sources prior to the Hamite invasion of Western Asia and Egypt.

which is veiled under the Allegory of the Flood. The chronological scheme of Berosus has come down to us through Eusebius and Syncellus. Without going into particulars, it was my good fortune to discover that the Second Median (Elamite) Dynasty reigned one hundred and forty-eight years instead of forty-eight, and that the five hundred and twenty-six years of the last forty kings extend down to the era of Nabonassar, 747 B. C. We accordingly have (omitting the mythological dynasties before the flood) the following result :

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Date of Elamite Invasion, . . . . .              | 2348 B. C. |
| First Dynasty of eight Median (Elamite) kings, . | 224        |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 2124 B. C. |
| Second Dynasty of eleven Median (Elamite)        |            |
| kings (48), . . . . .                            | 148        |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1976 B. C. |
| Third Dynasty of forty-nine Chaldean kings, . .  | 458        |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1518 B. C. |
| Fourth Dynasty of nine Arabian kings, . . . . .  | 245        |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1273 B. C. |
| Fifth Dynasty of forty Babylonian kings, . . . . | 526        |
|  | <hr/>      |
| Beginning of reign of Nabonassar, . . . . .      | 747 B. C.  |

After mentioning the nine Arabian kings, whose dynasty came to a close in the year 1273 B. C., Eusebius also mentioned Semiramis, who reigned over the Assyrians; and some Assyriologists have, therefore, placed her at the *head* of the succeeding dynasty, and termed its forty kings "Assyrians." This assumption is not borne out by the monuments, but is flatly contradicted by the known facts of Babylonian and Assyrian history. The first eight Elamite kings,

called "tyrants," held their court at Shushan (Susiana) in Elam, and dominated Babylonia, Western Asia, and Egypt. One of their number, Kudur Nanchundi, about 2280 B. C., carried off the image of Nana, or Ishtar, from Erech to Shushan, where it remained 1,635 years, until that city was captured by Assurbanipal in his eighth expedition, which could not have been earlier than 645 B. C., for Saulmugina (Samuges, Saosduchinu), his brother, who reigned over Babylon from 667 B. C. to 647 B. C., was overthrown and killed in his sixth expedition.

The eleven Elamite kings, who reigned one hundred and forty-eight years, probably resided in Babylonia, but were tributary to the king in Elam. A succession of eleven kings in one hundred and forty-eight years indicates an uncertain tenure of office, dependent on some paramount power.

A change of dynasty took place 1976 B. C., when the Elamite kings were succeeded by native Chaldeans, and it was shortly after this revolution that Abraham left Ur, and removed to Haran of Mesopotamia.

About 1921 B. C. the expedition of Kudur-lagomer and his associate kings took place. At this time the Chaldean kings were still subject to the Hamite rulers in Elam. The Canaanites had served Kudur-lagomer, king of the Elamites, twelve years; but in the thirteenth year they revolted from him, and in the fourteenth year the Elamite monarch, with his tributary kings, among whom was Amraphel, king of Babylonia, invaded Canaan, reduced the rebellious kings

to submission, ravaged the country to the plain of Pharan in the wilderness, and carried off all the substance of the smitten people.

In the time of Amenophis IV these Chaldean kings were still ruling in Babylonia, and they continued to rule until within twenty-seven years of the Exodus, when they were succeeded by an Arabian dynasty.

From the accession of Sennacherib, 704 B. C., the "Canon of Ptolemy" and the extracts from Berosus compare as follows:

| Ptolemy.                         |   | Berosus.                         |
|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 1st Interregnum, 2-704 B. C.     | } | Sennacherib, . . 24-704 B. C.    |
| Belibu, . . . . . 3-702 B. C.    |   |                                  |
| Aparanadiu, . . . 6-699 B. C.    |   |                                  |
| Regebelu, . . . . 1-693 B. C.    |   |                                  |
| Mesesemordaku, 4-692 B. C.       |   |                                  |
| 2d Interregnum, 8-688 B. C.      |   |                                  |
| Asaradinu, . . . . 13-680 B. C.  |   | Asaradan (5+8), . 13-680 B. C.   |
| Saosduchinu, . . . 20-667 B. C.  |   | Samuges, . . . . 21-667 B. C.    |
| Kinneladanu, . . . 22-647 B. C.  |   | Sardanapalus, . . 21-646 B. C.   |
| Nabopolasaru, . . . 21-625 B. C. |   | Nabopalassoru, . . 21-625 B. C.  |
| Nabokolasaru, . . . 43-604 B. C. |   | Nabocodrossoru, 43-604 B. C.     |
| Illoarudamu, . . . 2-561 B. C.   |   | Amilmaroduch(12) 2-561 B. C.     |
| Nerigassolassar, 4-559 B. C.     |   | Neglisarus, . . . . 4-559 B. C.  |
| Nabonadiu, . . . . 17-555 B. C.  |   | Nabonedus, . . . . 17-555 B. C.  |
| Kyru, . . . . . . 9-538 B. C.    |   | Cyrus, . . . . . . 9-538 B. C.   |
| Kambysu, . . . . . 8-529 B. C.   |   | Cambyses, . . . . . 8-529 B. C.  |
| Dareiu, . . . . . . 36-521 B. C. |   | Darius, . . . . . . 36-521 B. C. |

Saosduchinu is a corruption of Saulmugina, the brother of Assurbanipal, who was *appointed* king of Babylon, and reigned from 667 B. C. to his death, which occurred 647 B. C.

Kinneladanu is Sardanapalus; that is, Assurbanipal, the "brother" of Saulmugina.

During the twenty-four years of Sennacherib—that is, from 704 to 680 B. C.—Babylon was governed by rulers set up and deposed by the Assyrian monarch, among them his son Assardan, or “Aparadinu” (a corruption of Assaradinu). Mardok-empalu—that is, Marduk-Baladan—began to reign 721 B. C., and was succeeded by Sarkona, 709 B. C., showing that he was appointed by Sarkon, when the latter became king of Assyria, and governed Babylonia in his name.

Comparing the reigns of the Babylonian and Assyrian kings, we find the following points of agreement:

|                             |                                |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Nabonassar, . . . 747-733   | } Tiglath Pileser, . . 744-726 |
| Nadin, . . . . . 733-731    |                                |
| Xinzirukai Poru, . 731-726  |                                |
| Ilulain, . . . . . 726-721  | Shalmaneser, . . . . 726-721   |
| Mardukempalu, . . 721-709   | } Sar-kon-a, . . . . . 721-704 |
| Sarkeanu, . . . . . 709-704 |                                |
| (Sennacherib), . . . . .    | Sennacherib, . . . . 704-680   |
| Assaradinu, . . . . 680-667 | Assar-adin, . . . . . 680-667  |
| Saoeduchinu, . . . 667-647  | } Assar-banipal, . . . 667-625 |
| Kinneladinu, . . . 647-625  |                                |

We have seen that the “Canon of Ptolemy” coincides *throughout* with the absolute astronomical dates of the Egyptians, and we now see that the numbers of Berosus subsequent to the Era of Nabonidus, 747 B. C., agree with the “Canon of Ptolemy” and the chronological lists of the Assyrians, which are supported by several eclipses of the sun. It results that the numbers of Berosus are also derived from astronomical observations. Now, as Berosus, who had access to the monuments, annals, histories, chronological lists, and astronomical observations of the

Babylonians, did not place any of the historical kings further back than 2348 B. C., his date for the Median invasion, it seems strange that modern Assyriologists, with the meager and fragmentary materials at their disposal, should presume to fix the reign of Naramsin, for instance, at 3750 B. C. I am convinced that this king, who belongs to the Sin or *Chons* series, reigned at, or shortly after, 1824 B. C. As the Babylonians and Assyrians derived their notions of astronomy and the sciences generally from the Egyptians, it is probable that the titles of their kings were influenced, to a greater or less extent, by the Sothiac months in which their respective reigns happened to fall.

Thus, according to Rawlinson, Bel-sumili-kapu, who was called the "founder" of the Assyrian kingdom on a genealogical tablet, means "Bel, the left-handed," from *sumili*, left, and *kapu*, hand. This is equivalent to Ra *reversing* his course at the summer solstice (*ian ab*), and points to the epoch of *Phar-em-hat*, 2064 B. C. According to Berosus, this date is sixty years after the beginning of the Second Dynasty, and agrees with the Mosaic account, which places the building of Nineveh *after* the foundation of the Babylonian kingdom by Nimrod.

Nin, or Ninip, the Assyrian Hercules, corresponds to Horus, the "Powerful Bull" (*Ka-necht*), and is often called pal-Assur, "son of Assur," just as Horus is called *sa Hus-ir*, "son of Osiris." In the form "Pal-uziri," the Egyptian name appears unchanged. The month of Thoth was sacred to the youthful Horus.

Is it owing to chance that between 1324 B. C. and 1204 B. C. we find such titles as Tiglath-nin, Nin-pal-uziri, etc.?

In Nineveh there was, beside the temple of Nin, an ancient temple of Ishtar, the "great mother," the Assyrian counterpart of Isis, the mother of Harpocrates (*Har-pa-chrat*). George Smith discovered among the ruins of the palace of Shalmaneser I, at Nineveh, a votive dish belonging to this temple, on which is the following inscription:

"Shalmaneser, the powerful king, king of nations, king of Assyria; son of Vul-nirari, the powerful king, king of nations, king of Assyria; son of Pudiel, the powerful king, king of nations, king of Assyria also. Conqueror of . . . . Niri, Lulumu . . . . and Muzri, who in the service of Ishtar (Isis), his lady, has marched and has no rival, who in the midst of battle has fought and has conquered their lands. When the temple of Ishtar, the lady of Nineveh, *my* lady, which Shamsi-Vul (follower of Vul), the prince who went before me, had built, and which had decayed, and which Assur-ubalid, my father, had restored; that temple in the course of my time had decayed, and I rebuilt it from its foundation to its roof."

A brick discovered on the same spot by Smith has this inscription:

"Tiglathi-Nin, king of nations, son of Shalmaneser, king of nations also, who completed the temple of Ishtar, the powerful lady."

Assur-uballid was a contemporary of Amenophis IV, whose reign extended from 1658 to 1646 B. C., consequently his reign fell in the Sothiac month of

*Pa-uoni*, 1704 to 1584 B. C., which was sacred to Isis and Osiris. This king, therefore, felt called upon to restore the temple of Ishtar, because she was pre-eminently "*his lady*." Shamsi-Vul, the son of the Babylonian King Ismi-dagon, built this temple. After it had stood six hundred and forty-one years, it was torn down on account of its ruined condition, and sixty years after this it was rebuilt by Shalmaneser I, who reigned in the Sothiac month of Messori, 1464 B. C. to 1324 B. C. Shalmaneser found the temple of Ishtar again decayed since the time of "*his father*," Assur-uballid, and rebuilt it from its foundation to its roof. Could a better or more convincing proof of his epoch be furnished than this? He died before he had entirely completed the temple, and his son, Tiglathi-Nin, who headed the new cycle, completed it.

Shalmaneser, in the above inscription, calls himself "son of Vulnirari, son of Pudil;" and Vulnirari calls himself "son of Pudiel, grandson of Vulnirari, and great-grandson of Assur-uballid." Assyriologists have inferred from this that these kings represent a genealogical succession from father to son, and have placed Assur-uballid at circa 1400 B. C. We have just seen that Shalmaneser calls Assur-uballid "*his father*," although he preceded him by several centuries. In these inscriptions the word "father" is often used in the sense of ancestor—the most distinguished ancestors being selected as "fathers," while the insignificant ones were passed over in silence, and even omitted from the genealogical tables. We have seen that Assur-uballid, of whom Vulnirari says, "The protec-

tion and alliance of his kingdom extended afar off like a mountain," and who was described as one of the most powerful of the Assyrian kings, restored the temple of Ishtar, and that it had again decayed by the time of Shalmaneser I. This would hardly have been the case if only sixty or seventy years had intervened between these two kings, but harmonizes perfectly with a period of two centuries or more. George Smith, as late as 1875, placed Buzur-Assur immediately before Assur-uballid, and fixed his date at 1420-1400 B. C., while he placed Assur-nadin-achi about 1550 B. C. We now know that Assur-nadin-achi was the father and immediate predecessor of Assur-uballid. The latter expressly mentions his father, Assur-nadin-achi, in a letter to Amenophis IV.

A. H. Sayce, referring to Professor Hommel's recent work, "Aus der Babylonischen Alterthumskunde" (Academy of September 7, 1895, p. 189), says:

"Perhaps one of the most interesting facts brought to light by the Professor is, that Ine-Sin, who was king of Ur about 2500 B. C. (?), or earlier, and in whose reign portions of the great Babylonian work on astronomy were compiled, subdued both Kimas, or Central Arabia, and Zemar in Phœnicia (see Gen. x, 18), while his daughter was *patesi*, or high priestess, of Anzan in Elam and Mark-haskhi in Northern Syria, where the Hittites were already astir. Still more interesting is the discovery made by Mr. Pinches of a tablet recording the war waged by Khammurabi of Babylon (B. C. 2250) against Eri-aku, or Arioch, of Larsa, and his Elamite allies, which ended in the rise of a united monarchy in Babylon. Among the op-

ponents of Khammurabi mention is made of Kudur-lagomer, the Elamite, Eri-aku (Arioch), and Tud-khal, the Tidal of the Book of Genesis."

The same author (Academy of November 23, 1895) says further:

"Mr. Pinches' latest discovery is a highly interesting one, and throws fresh light on the intimate relations that existed between Babylonia and Syria in the age of Abraham. Professor Hommel may yet prove right in his suggestion that the defeat of Chedor-laomer and his allies by the Hebrew patriarch was the ultimate cause of Khammurabi's success in overthrowing Arioch and the Elamite supremacy over Babylonia, and in establishing a united and independent Babylonian kingdom."

In the same article of September 7, 1895, Sayce asserts that the name of the Hyksos ('*Aam-u*) god Sutech is Kassite, and that the suggestion of Brugsch that the Hyksos came from the mountains of Elam is confirmed. A Babylonian seal cylinder (No. 391) in the Metropolitan Museum of New York bears an inscription which shows that it belonged to Uzi-Sutach, son of the Kassite (Kassu), the servant of Burnaburyas, a king of the Kassite (?) Dynasty, who ruled over Babylonia B. C. 1400 (?). The name Sutach is preceded by the determinative of divinity. We can infer that the Hyksos (?) leaders were of Kassite origin. The Hyksos invasion of Egypt formed part of the general movement which led to the rise of the Kassite Dynasty in Babylonia.

Thus Professor Sayce places Ine-Sin at 2500 B. C.,

Hammurabi at 2250 B. C., and Burna-buryas at 1400 B. C. All of these dates are notoriously incorrect, and show that modern Babylonian chronology prior to about 930 B. C. can hardly be termed a science, but is principally conjecture and guess-work.

We have seen that Burna-buryas was reigning about 1658 B. C. The connection of Hammurabi, king of Babylon, with Kudur-laomer, king of Elam, Arioeh, king of Larsa, and Tidal, king of foreign tribes (*sat-u*), shows that he was Amraphel, king of Shinar, a contemporary of Abraham, and, therefore, reigned about 1921 B. C. Ine-Sin, as his name indicates, must be placed after 1824 B. C. We should bear in mind that Ham is the *Egyptian* name for the yellow Asiatic, or Mongolian, race; but that these people, when they emerged from behind the mountains of Elam, were known in Asia as Kashi, Hittites, Canaanites, etc. They were called Akkadians, or Elamites, not because they were Medes, but because, after having roamed over the boundless plains of Asia for untold centuries, they crossed Persia and appeared to come from that country. Manetho was well aware that they were a "people of ignoble birth," who came from the "eastern parts."

Berosus gives his First and Second Dynasties three hundred and seventy-two years. Manetho fixes the 'Aamu domination over Egypt at five hundred and eleven years. Thus we need not wonder to find Western Asia, including Canaan, completely Hamitized by 1837 B. C.

The Assyrians, in my opinion, originally came

from Europe, and settled in the alluvial plains of Babylonia by the side of yellow Asiatics. They were all overwhelmed by the great Hamite flood. Under the native Chaldean Dynasty, which was founded about 1976 B. C., large numbers of these so-called Shemites emigrated to Assyria and Mesopotamia. An examination of the ancient table adopted by Moses will show that the Shemites and Japhites of Western Asia were successive overflows of Europeans; for the "sons of Japheth," from the nation of the Medes and Persians in the East to the Ionians in the west, were seated immediately north of—that is, *behind*—the Shemites.

The most ancient inscriptions of Babylonia mention four races (lit. "four tongues"), which seem to have been: (1) the aborigines, or Chaldeans; (2) the Shemites; (3) the Japhites; and (4) the Elamites.

Before the Flood the country was divided into numerous petty principalities, each considerable city being independent. There was no kingdom to chronicle, no government claiming universal dominion like that in Egypt, no civilization worthy of the name. In the time of Kudur-laomer, king of Elam, Babylonia was still divided up into several distinct kingdoms, and it would be a great mistake to compute these contemporary local dynasties as consecutive.

We might as well swell the period between the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties of Egypt from 753 to 1,255 years, by including in the chronological series the contemporary Fourteenth and Seventeenth Dynasties. It will prove to be just as fatal to run amuck

of Berosus, as it has been to disregard the numbers of Manetho. As in Egypt, the sun had numerous distinctive titles to mark his position in the Sothiac year. We have seen that Bel, Anu, Hea, and Ishtar presided over separate quarters of the year, and that these titles are equivalent to *Ra*, *Tum*, *Thoth*, and *Hathor*. In addition to these, we find *Ninip*, *Mero-dach*, *Nergal*, etc., and it would repay the trouble to ascertain in what relation these stood to *Horus*, the Powerful Bull, *Shu*, *Menthu*, *Harmachis*, etc.

Bel seems to be the chief title of the Kassite divinity *Sutech*, whose emblem was the serpent, and it is significant that he was the principal deity of the Babylonian Cushites. The Assyrians, on the contrary, refused to accept *Sutech* as their "lord god;" but worshiped *Assur*, or *Osiris*, as their "chief god," and the effect of this was that, in the course of time, many of the distinctive attributes of *Horus*, *Menthu*, and *Ra* were transferred to *Assur*. In some respects, *Assur* seems to have been recognized as the divinity itself, for he is represented by the winged globe inclosing the head of man. It is to the lasting credit of the Assyrians that they discarded the serpent, and adopted the primitive Egyptian emblem of the Word.

### EPOCH-REIGNS OF MANETHO'S THIRD CYCLE

The Manethonian Lists which have reached us through *Africanus*, *Eusebius*, and *Syncellus*, were originally dynastic—that is, gave the entire reigns without regard to Sothiac divisions; but, notwith-

standing this fact, a combination of favorable accidents has, nevertheless, revealed all the epoch-reigns of Manetho's Third Sothiac Cycle, beginning 1324 B. C., and ending 339 B. C.

As the epoch-reigns, supported by the distinctive epoch-titles, extend in an almost unbroken line from 4244 B. C. to 1324 B. C., it is evident that the Sothiac system, *as a whole*, was subjected to a "crucial test" the very moment it came in contact with well-known dates fixed or established in other and independent ways. This "crucial test," which can now be applied by means of the "absolute dates" afforded by the epoch-reigns, it has borne, and ever will bear, triumphantly.

#### EPOCH OF THOTH, 1324 B. C.

Beginning at the Era of Menophres, 1324 B. C., which is also the beginning of the first Sothiac month called Thoth, we find the epoch-reign of Athothis, who reigned twenty-nine years after the epoch. This important era was indelibly fixed in several ways. The short reign of *Ta-ur-et*, "Thouris" (the standing female hippopotamus carrying the crocodile on her back), was emblematic of the close of the cycle and last month of the year. We need not repeat that the standing female hippopotamus was the symbol of a completed Sothiac year, the crocodile, the symbol of a Sothiac month, and that the two could be thus joined only at the end of a Sothiac year. This is the same identical old hippopotamus that devoured Menes, the first king of Egypt, about 4244 B. C.,

and we need not be surprised to find that she devoured King Ramesses, who mounted the double throne of Egypt about 1331 B. C., in the same voracious manner. Fortunately, both of these kings were "re-born" like Jonas and "re-crowned" (*nem-chau*) under the significant and appropriate epoch-title Athothis, "Offspring of Thoth." Ramesses commemorated the event by inserting in his official cartouch *Cha-em-uas*, "Crowned in Thebes."

The forger of the pseudo-Sothis List placed Athothis at the head of the space left blank by the removal of the seven kings of the Twentieth Dynasty, where he now appears as "No. 59 Athothis, who is also Psusanos," with twenty-eight years. We have already seen how and why Athothis was confounded with Athoris, one of the epoch-titles of Psusannos I, 1084 B. C. The *sa ra* title of this king, inclosed in the shield, is very elaborate; it reads: "Ramesses, Chamois, Miamen, *Hyk-ôn-nuter*." It may be that he, instead of Ramesses III, was the Rhampsinitus of Herodotus; for, just as Ramesses *Hyk-ôn* became Rhampsakes, Ramesses *Hyk-ôn-nuter*, by omitting *hyk* or *hak*, would naturally resolve itself into Rhampsinuti.


The two epoch-kings of the Twentieth Dynasty are now known as Ramesses XIII and Ramesses IX. I have selected the former as the epoch-king Athothis because he is the only king of this dynasty who is known to have borne the title "Menophres" (*Mer-na-ph'ra*), and because the location of his tomb, the length of his reign, the position of his inscriptions,

and the portions of the Temple of *Chonsu* completed or erected by him, all mark him as the immediate successor of the sons of Ramesses III. In the rooms of the sanctuary of the Temple of *Chonsu*, the portion first built, we find the names of Ramesses III, Ramesses IV, and Ramesses Menophres. We select the following inscription from Baedeker:

“Ramesses etc. (Menophres) erected this building in the house of his father *Chonsu*, the lord of Thebes, and built this temple in everlasting workmanship of good limestone and sandstone.”

The hall supported by eight columns, in front of the sanctuary and immediately behind the peristyle court, was erected and decorated by this king, showing that he was the first, and not the last, king of this dynasty.

We have seen that the Babylonians placed *Ânu* over the last quarter of the year, who, as I contend, was derived from the Egyptian *Ânu* or *Ôn*. In Lepsius' "Book of Kings," No. 506, giving the titles of Ramesses VI, there is a procession of so-called gods and goddesses representing the Sothiac year, at the beginning of which stands the hieroglyphic symbol *Ânu* or *Ôn*, followed by *Set*, *Harpokrates*, and *Amen-hi-chopesh-ef*. *Amen*, with the *Chopesh* in his hand, stands bridging the chasm between the last quarter of the closing year and the first quarter of the coming year, a Theban notion, pure and simple. Thus the titles *Hyk-ôn* and *Hyk-ôn-nuter* belong to the last quarter of the Second Cycle. The fact that Meno-



phres assumed this title *as king* indicates that he mounted the throne before the era 1324 B. C. The title *Amen-hi-chopesh-ef*, borne by several of these kings, also fixes them either just before or after this era. In the temple above mentioned *Chonsu* is represented as a moon-god, so-called, with the crescent on his head, and the sidelock of youth, that is, as the Theban counterpart of Thoth-Hermes. This temple was founded by Ramesses III during the co-regency of his son Ramesses IV, in anticipation of the coming epoch of Thoth, and the latter, no doubt, expected to head the new era, which he might have done if he had lived to reign as long as his father.

Rhampsakes can not be the rich and miserly Rhampsinitus described by Herodotus, for the former was one of the most generous and liberal-minded kings to be found in Egyptian history. Rhampsinitus descended alive into the place called Hades (Amenti), and there played at dice with Ceres, sometimes winning, at other times losing, after which he came back again, bringing as a present from her a napkin of gold. This is the story as related by Herodotus; but Plutarch, in his "Isis and Osiris," tells us that it was Thoth who played with Selene. It was because Rhampsinitus was "re-born" and "re-crowned" as Athothis that the Egyptian priests communicated to Herodotus this highly symbolized story.

It was on account of the new Sothiac year that the Egyptians celebrated the festival. The two wolves by whom the blindfolded priest was led to the temple of Ceres were the twin-wolves of the

winter solstice—the double-faced Janus before the temple of the “peace-loving” *Chonsu*.

EPOCH OF PAOPHI, 1204 B. C.

The epoch-king of Paophi 1204 B. C. was distinguished by several epoch-titles, all of which were descriptive of the Nile. *Pa-iar*, “The River,” or *Phuoro*, and *Iar-bashi*, “Gushing River,” or *Iorbasse*, gave rise to the familiar title “King Nile.”

We will now go back to the era, place the epoch-reign of Athothis where it certainly belongs, allow one hundred and twenty years for the month of Thoth, and demonstrate, by simple addition, that the epoch of Paophi fell in the fourth year of *Ramesses Iorbasse*.

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Era of Menophres, . . . . .              | 1324 B. C. |
| Athothis, . . . . .                      | 29         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1295 B. C. |
| Ramessomenes, . . . . .                  | 15         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1280 B. C. |
| Ramesse Usimares, . . . . .              | 31         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1249 B. C. |
| Ramesesseos, . . . . .                   | 23         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1226 B. C. |
| Ramessameno, . . . . .                   | 19         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1207 B. C. |
| Ramesse Iubasse, before epoch, . . . . . | 3          |
|  | <hr/>      |
| Epoch of Paophi, . . . . .               | 1204 B. C. |
| Ramesse Iubasse, as King Nile, . . . . . | 36         |

These reigns are taken as they now stand in the pseudo-Sothis List, where they are numbered from 18 to 24 inclusive.

Manetho, it seems, had compared the first four epoch-kings of this cycle with those of the first cycle, owing to which fact we find this reign entered a second time as "No. 60 Kenkenes," with thirty-nine years, in the false Sothis List.

The title *Cha-em-uas* marks Ramesses IX *Nofer-ka-ra* as the epoch-king Nile. Dikaearchos, as we have seen, placed him four hundred and thirty-six years before the first Olympiad. Pliny refers to him as "Rhamesis who reigned when Troy was taken." At this time Thebes was in all her glory, and was, in fact, the great capital of Egypt.

Now Thebes seems to have been the capital when Homer wrote the Iliad, for we can safely assume that, if the capital had been removed to Tanis at that time, the poet would have mentioned the fact.

The name Memnon mentioned by Homer is *Mer-amen*, Me-amen, slightly modified. This name was borne by King Nile, and was in common use among the kings of the Twentieth Dynasty.

Coming back to the epoch-title Nile, we have seen that it was used by Eratosthenes to mark the epoch of Paophi 2664 B. C. The form *Pa-iar*, literally "the River," is one peculiarly adapted to Egypt, where there is but one river. Moses, in speaking of Eden, which was certainly Egypt, describes it as watered by a river. The four outlets of this river were called "heads," because they emptied into the Mediterranean at the extreme northern boundary of the land, called *Em-het*, meaning literally "at the head."

Thus the epoch-title "Phuoro" is so well authenticated, in every imaginable way, that it may be pronounced notorious.

#### EPOCH OF ATHYR, 1084 B. C.

No. 60 of the pseudo-Sothis List, corresponding to the Twentieth Dynasty, is "Uen-nephis" with a reign of forty-two years. We have already explained that *Uon-nofer*, "Perfect Being," was an epoch-title used to designate the month of Athyr, or *Haet-har*. Beginning at the epoch of Paophi 1204 B. C., and coming down to the next epoch, we find that Psusannos I, the second king of Manetho's Twenty-first Dynasty, who reigned forty-two years, was, in fact, this epoch-king.

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Era of Paophi, . . . . .                         | 1204 B. C. |
| Ramesse Iorbasse, as epoch-king, . . . . .       | 36         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1168 B. C. |
| Ramesse Uaphru, . . . . .                        | 29         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1139 B. C. |
| Smendes ( <i>Sa-menthu</i> ), . . . . .          | 26         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1113 B. C. |
| Psusannos, before epoch, . . . . .               | 29         |
|  | <hr/>      |
| Epoch of Athyr, . . . . .                        | 1084 B. C. |
| Psusannos, after epoch, as "'Athoris," . . . . . | 14         |
|  | <hr/>      |
|  | 1070 B. C. |

We have seen how the twenty-eight years, x months, and x days of Psusannos, before the epoch, were converted into Athothis; No. 43 of the pseudo-Sothis List, corresponding to the latter part of the Eighteenth Dynasty, to wit: "'Athoris," with twenty-nine years, is this portion of the reign. In the List

of Africanus the last fourteen years of this reign have been substituted for the thirty-five years of Psusannos II. Thus we have the entire reign, and both fragments of the reign, and two unmistakable epoch-titles.

Venus, the star of Isis and Osiris, was known as Hathor on the eastern horizon. One of the distinctive titles of Hathor was *Pa-nozem*, or, as it was afterwards pronounced, *Pi-notem*, meaning "The Gentle One." It will be seen, therefore, that *Pi-notem* is an epoch-title itself.

The kings of the Twenty-first Dynasty rarely inclosed their titles in the customary royal cartouches. It seems that they held their court at Tanis, and ranked as high-priests of Amen at Thebes. I have already given my reasons for believing that they were subject to the Ethiopian kings. They were not usurpers, but merely reigned in the place of the unfortunate Ramessids, who had been deposed by the Ethiopians. A criminally licentious and voluptuous mode of living brought down upon the last kings of the Twentieth Dynasty its own self-inflicted punishment.

#### EPOCH OF CHOIAHK, 946 B. C.

The reign of Osarkon II *Sa-bastet*, who was the epoch-king of Choiahk 946 B. C., was transferred to the pseudo-Sothis List, where it now appears as "No. 45-Susakeim" with thirty-four years. This name is a curious blending of *Sesak* (*Sheshank*) and Osarkon. In tracing the chronology down from the last epoch, we must not forget that the Twenty-first Dynasty

reigned, altogether, one hundred and thirty years, from 1139 B. C. to 1009 B. C. The epoch-king Psusannos has forty-one or forty-two years—that is, forty-one years, x months, etc.—so that the present apportionment of the parts as twenty-nine and fourteen years, respectively, is nearly two years in excess of the true number.

We do not know how the extra months and days of the succeeding reigns have been apportioned; therefore, it is better to reduce the reign of Psusannos to the required forty-one years by making his epoch-reign twelve instead of fourteen years.

Beginning at the last epoch, the month of Athyr can be filled out from the lists, as follows:

|   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| Epoch of Athyr, . . . . .                           | 1084 B. C.        |
| Psusannos, as 'Athoris, . . . . .                   | 12                |
|   | <u>1072 B. C.</u> |
| Nephercheres, . . . . .                             | 4                 |
|   | <u>1068 B. C.</u> |
| Amenophthis, . . . . .                              | 9                 |
|   | <u>1059 B. C.</u> |
| Osorchor, . . . . .                                 | 6                 |
|   | <u>1053 B. C.</u> |
| Psinaches, . . . . .                                | 9                 |
|   | <u>1044 B. C.</u> |
| Psusannos II, . . . . .                             | 35                |
|   | <u>1009 B. C.</u> |
| Sesonchis (Shishak), . . . . .                      | 21                |
|   | <u>988 B. C.</u>  |
| Osarkon (15-1, for 14 years, x months, etc.), . . . | 14                |
|   | <u>974 B. C.</u>  |
| Takelothis (x months and x days), . . . . .         | 1                 |
|   | <u>973 B. C.</u>  |

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <i>Brought forward</i> , . . . . .                  | 973 B. C. |
| Osarkon II, before epoch, . . . . .                 | <u>9</u>  |
| Epoch of Choiahk, . . . . .                         | 964 B. C. |
| Osarkon II, after epoch, as "Petubastia", . . . . . | <u>25</u> |
|   | 939 B. C. |

Here again, I am happy to say, the entire reign of thirty-four years, the two fragments of nine and twenty-five years each, and the ancient epoch-titles, have all been preserved and transmitted to us through ignorance alone. We have seen how the author of the false Sothis List made use of the entire reign to partially fill the blank left in the Twentieth Dynasty.

Eusebius, in his endeavor to reduce the totals of these dynasties, substituted "Petubastis" with twenty-five years for Petsibastis with forty years, at the head of the Twenty-third Dynasty, and Osorthon, "the Egyptian Hercules" (!) with nine years for the second reign of that dynasty.

When Horus crossed the equator on the first day of Choiahk, he entered the northern hemisphere as the "powerful bull" (*ka-necht*), awakening the vegetable world to life; hence he was compared to Hercules and to Min, Pan, and Bastet. It was in commemoration of this great epoch that Osarkon II erected the beautiful "festival hall" in the temple of *Bastet*, in her city of Bubastis, the ruins of which were recently discovered by Naville. One of the "*sa ra*" titles assumed by this king, to wit, *Sa-bastet*, "Son of Bast," points to the same epoch. Among the people his epoch-title was *Pa-ta-bastet*, or "Petubastis," "The Gift of Bast."

Manetho gives Shishak, the king who plundered Jerusalem in the fifth year of Rehoboam, twenty-one years; but it is possible that he reigned jointly with his son Osarkon I after 988 B. C., and that Manetho assigned the "joint-reign" to the latter. Be this as it may, 988 B. C. is the most probable date for this celebrated Biblical event.

#### EPOCH OF TYBI, 844 B. C.

We wish to remind the reader of the lion-headed *Tef-nut*, sometimes called *Tef-teb*. One of her distinctive titles was *Ta-mui-t*, "The Lioness." Applied to a king, in the masculine gender, it would be *Pa-mui*.

Now let us see if the king called *Pa-mui* is the epoch-king known as "Psamuis," that is, *Pa-sa-mui*?

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Epoch of Choiahk, . . . . .                          | 964 B. C. |
| Osarkon II, as Petubastis, . . . . .                 | 25        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 939 B. C. |
| Sheshonk II, . . . . .                               | 25        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 914 B. C. |
| Takelothis II, . . . . .                             | 13        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 901 B. C. |
| Sheshonk III, . . . . .                              | 53        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 948 B. C. |
| <i>Pa-mui</i> , before epoch, . . . . .              | 4         |
|  | <hr/>     |
| Epoch of Tybi, . . . . .                             | 844 B. C. |
| <i>Pa-mui</i> , after epoch, as "Psamuis," . . . . . | 13        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 831 B. C. |

"No. 51 Psamuthis," with thirteen years, and "No. 52 blank," with four years, of the false Sothis List, represent the above fragments of this reign as split

by the epoch. The forger, naturally enough, mistook "Psamuis" for "Psamuthis." Thus the entire reign of *Pa-mui*, called *Pi-mai* by Brugsch, was seventeen years. The titles themselves are so transparent that they require no additional elucidation.

EPOCH OF AMHIR, 724 B. C.

Saites, Zet, or Sethon has received our special attention in the chapter devoted to the Twenty-fourth Dynasty. He mounted the throne as subject-king under Sabakon, 730 B. C., reigned six years before, and thirty-eight years after, this epoch, or, altogether, forty-four years. Beginning at the last epoch, we can verify these dates as follows:

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Epoch of Tybi, . . . . .                 | 844 B. C. |
| Psamuis, . . . . .                       | 13        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 831 B. C. |
| Sheshonk IV, . . . . .                   | 42        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 789 B. C. |
| Petsabastia, . . . . .                   | 40        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 749 B. C. |
| Osorthon (8), . . . . .                  | 9         |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 740 B. C. |
| Pnammus ( <i>Psa-muth</i> ), . . . . .   | 10        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 730 B. C. |
| Zet, before epoch, . . . . .             | 6         |
|  | <hr/>     |
| Epoch of Am-hir, . . . . .               | 724 B. C. |
| Zet, after epoch, as "Amiria," . . . . . | 38        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 686 B. C. |

The epoch-title "Rokchoris," from *Rohk-ur*, "Great Heat," like that of "Rochles," from *Rohk-nes*, "Little Heat," in the Hyksos Dynasty, has become notorious. In Africanus we have "Bokchoris, Saites,"

(*Set*) with the first six years. In the false Sothis List, the entire reign and the last thirty-eight years still appear, as follows:

|                                   |          |
|-----------------------------------|----------|
| No. 74. Bokchoris, . . . . .      | 44 years |
| No. 78. Amaes (Amiris), . . . . . | 38 years |

Eusebius has "Ameris" at the head of his Twenty-sixth Dynasty, but his thirty-eight years have been reduced to eighteen. Thus the evidence of the division of the reign at the epoch 724 B. C. is complete, and the dates thereby established can be accepted as absolute.

#### EPOCH OF PHAMENOTH, 604 B. C.

Is it not remarkable that we require the long-lost epoch-reign of Zet to lead us down to the epoch of Phamenoth 604 B. C. in the eighth year of Nechao's reign? Notice how this reign supports and verifies the chronology of this important and interesting period:

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Epoch of Mechir, . . . . .             | 724 B. C.       |
| Zet, as epoch-king "Amiris," . . . . . | 38              |
|  | <hr/> 686 B. C. |
| Tephnachtis, . . . . .                 | 7               |
|  | <hr/> 679 B. C. |
| Nechepsos, . . . . .                   | 6               |
|  | <hr/> 673 B. C. |
| Nechao I, . . . . .                    | 8               |
|  | <hr/> 665 B. C. |
| Psammetichos I, . . . . .              | 54              |
|  | <hr/> 611 B. C. |
| Nechao II, before epoch, . . . . .     | 7               |
|  | <hr/> 604 B. C. |
| Epoch of Phamenoth, . . . . .          | 604 B. C.       |
| Nechao II, after epoch, . . . . .      | 9               |
|  | <hr/> 595 B. C. |

Remember that 604 B. C. was the summer solstice of the Sothiac year. The sun was *am-hat*, "at the heart," or middle, of his annual course. We have already explained the titles *Uah-ab-ra* and *Nem-ab-ra*. The division of Nechao's reign by the epoch of 604 B. C. is still shown by the lists. "No. 83, Nechao Pharaoh," with nine years, of the pseudo-Sothis List, is the original epoch-reign. The six or seven years before the epoch appear in the Lists of Africanus and Eusebius. Thus the date 611 B. C. for the accession of Neko, the Pharaoh mentioned in the Bible in connection with the Jewish king Josiah, is absolute, because astronomically fixed.

**EPOCH OF PHARMUTHI, 484 B. C.**

We are now upon firm historical ground, and can use the astronomical Canon of Ptolemy as a check. Beginning at the epoch 604 B. C., a simple computation will show that Xerxes commenced to reign 485 B. C., or just *one* year before the epoch of Pharmuthi 484 B. C.

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Epoch of Phamenoth, . . . . .               | 604 B. C. |
| Nechao, epoch-reign, . . . . .              | 9         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 595 B. C. |
| Psammetichos, " <i>another</i> ," . . . . . | 6         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 589 B. C. |
| Uaphris, . . . . .                          | 19        |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 570 B. C. |
| Amasis, . . . . .                           | 44        |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 526 B. C. |

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Brought forward,</i> . . . . .            | 526 B. C. |
| Psammecherites, . . . . .                    | I         |
|  | <hr/>     |
| Beginning of Persian Dynasty, . . . . .      | 525 B. C. |
| Cambyzes, from his fifth year, . . . . .     | 4         |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 521 B. C. |
| Daraïos, . . . . .                           | 36        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 485 B. C. |
| Xerxes, before epoch of Pharmuthi, . . . . . | I         |
|  | <hr/>     |
| Epoch of Pharmuthi, . . . . .                | 484 B. C. |
| Xerxes, after epoch, . . . . .               | 20        |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | 464 B. C. |

There was no room for the epoch-title "Psamuthis" among the well-known kings of the Persian Dynasty, and, for this reason, Psamuthis was substituted for Psammetichos II. But we also find Psamuthis *with one year* in the Twenty-ninth Dynasty of Africanus. Eusebius enters the reign before the epoch in the same dynasty, *first*, as "Psammuthis" with one year, and *second*, as "Muthis" with one year. Thus it is evident from the two forms, Psammuthis and Muthis, that Manetho not only gave the epoch-title itself, but explained that it meant "the son of Muth."

Now the Canon of Ptolemy, which is "astronomical," that is, adapted to the Sothiac epochs, likewise places the accession of Xerxes at 485 B. C.

#### EPOCH OF PACHONS, 364 B. C.


This is the last epoch mentioned by our trustworthy guide Manetho, for his work dates from the

accession of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 287 B. C. We will now begin where we left off:

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Epoch of Pharmuthi, . . . . .                         | 484 B. C. |
| Xerxes, after epoch, . . . . .                        | 20        |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 464 B. C. |
| Artabanos (7 months + x months of "Magoi"), . . . . . | 1         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 463 B. C. |
| Artaxerxes, . . . . .                                 | 41        |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 422 B. C. |
| Xerxes (2 months) Sogdianos (7 months), . . . . .     | 1         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 421 B. C. |
| Darius, . . . . .                                     | 19        |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 402 B. C. |
| Twenty-eighth Dynasty (Amyrtaios?), . . . . .         | 6         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 396 B. C. |
| Nepherites, . . . . .                                 | 6         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 390 B. C. |
| Achoris, . . . . .                                    | 13        |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 377 B. C. |
| Nepherites, . . . . .                                 | 1         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 376 B. C. |
| Nektarebes, before epoch, . . . . .                   | 12        |
|   | <hr/>     |
| Epoch of Pachona, . . . . .                           | 364 B. C. |
| Nektarebes, after epoch, as "Amyrtaios," . . . . .    | 6         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 358 B. C. |
| Tees, . . . . .                                       | 2         |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 356 B. C. |
| Nektanebos ( <i>Necht-neb-es</i> ), . . . . .         | 18        |
|   | <hr/>     |
| End of Thirtieth Dynasty, . . . . .                   | 339 B. C. |

The epoch-title "Amyrtaios," which is the same commented on in the Fifth Dynasty, was, by mistake, transferred to the Twenty-eighth Dynasty . It is a title applicable to *Chonsu*, the "peace-loving" son of Amen and Muth. Wherever the reigns were divided by Sothiac epochs some traces of the fact remain in the lists. In many instances these epochs have been the direct cause of the confusion and disturbance apparent in the lists. The later dynasties, showing reigns in months, such as those of Artabanos, Sogdianos, Nepherites, etc., will serve to illustrate how the "extra months," now wanting in the earlier lists, necessarily affect a computation according to Sothiac epochs of one hundred and twenty years.

Our work ends here, but the presence of such titles as Ptolemy Philadelphus, in the month of Pachons, and Ptolemy Euergetes, in the month of Payni, demonstrates that the Ptolemies themselves continued to rule according to the time-honored Sothiac system.



# INDEX

|                         | PAGE |
|-------------------------|------|
| PREFACE, . . . . .      | 3    |
| INTRODUCTION, . . . . . | II   |

## PART I

|  |    |
|--|----|
| THE SOTHIAC SYSTEM OF CHRONOLOGY AND THE CHRONOLOGICAL LISTS OF MANETHO, . . . . . | 23 |
| THE TWELVE MONTHS, . . . . .   | 31 |
| THE SIGNS OF THE ZODIAC DERIVED FROM THE SYMBOLS OF THE EGYPTIAN MONTHS, . . . . . | 48 |
| FORMATION OF THE SOLAR SYSTEM, . . . . .   | 56 |
| PRESENT STATE OF EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY, . . . . .                                    | 66 |
| "THE SOTHIAC YEAR," . . . . .  | 71 |
| MANETHO THE HISTORIAN, . . . . .   | 76 |
| THE CHRONOLOGICAL NUMBERS OF JOSEPHUS, . . . . .                                   | 84 |
| MANETHO'S GENERAL CHRONOLOGICAL SCHEME, . . . . .                                  | 91 |
| MANETHO'S GRAND TOTAL OF 3,555 YEARS, . . . . .                                    | 97 |

## PART II

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| A SELF-VERIFYING CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF ANCIENT EGYPT, FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE KINGDOM TO THE BEGINNING OF THE PERSIAN DYNASTY—A BOOK OF STARTLING DISCOVERIES—GRAND TOTALS OF MANETHO'S FIRST BOOK, . . . . . | 99  |
| "TEN THINITE KINGS WHO REIGNED (350) YEARS," . . . . .  | 103 |
| MANETHO'S FIRST DYNASTY OF EIGHT THINITE KINGS, . . . . .   | 104 |
| THE EPOCH-REIGNS OF THE FIRST DYNASTY, . . . . .  | 118 |
| MANETHO'S SECOND AND THIRD DYNASTIES, . . . . .   | 125 |
| EPOCH-KINGS OF THE THIRD DYNASTY, . . . . .   | 149 |
| MANETHO'S FOURTH DYNASTY, . . . . .   | 155 |
| THE CHUFUS, . . . . .   | 167 |

|   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| EPOCH-KINGS OF THE FOURTH DYNASTY. (ADDENDUM, 1898),  | 178  |
| FIFTH DYNASTY OF EIGHT MEMPHITE KINGS, . . . . .  | 186  |
| EPOCH-REIGNS OF THE FIFTH DYNASTY, . . . . .  | 192  |
| SIXTH DYNASTY OF SIX MEMPHITE KINGS, . . . . .  | 195  |
| SIXTH DYNASTY OF SIX ELEPHANTINEAN KINGS, . . . . .   | 195  |
| SEVENTH AND EIGHTH MEMPHITE DYNASTIES, . . . . .  | 210  |
| NINTH AND TENTH DYNASTIES OF HERAKLEOPOLIS, . . . . .                                       | 214  |
| ELEVENTH DYNASTY OF THEBES, . . . . .   | 216  |
| TABLE OF KARNAK—LEFT HALF, . . . . .  | 221  |
| ELEVENTH DYNASTY, FROM TABLE OF KARNAK, . . . . .   | 229  |
| CHU-MER-NA-PTAH AND SEM-SU HAR-PA-CHRAI, . . . . .  | 235  |
| THE GRAND TOTALS OF NINETY-SIX KINGS AND 2,121 YEARS<br>OF MANETHO'S SECOND BOOK, . . . . . | 237  |
| TABLE OF TWELFTH DYNASTY, . . . . .   | 247  |
| TWELFTH DYNASTY OF EIGHT THEBAN KINGS, . . . . .  | 248  |
| INTERVAL BETWEEN THE TWELFTH AND EIGHTEENTH DY-<br>NASTIES, . . . . .                       | 255  |
| THE EXTRACTS OF BARBARUS SCALIGERI FROM AFRICANUS,  | 263  |
| LOCATION OF THE PYRAMIDS, . . . . .   | 267  |
| THIRTEENTH DYNASTY OF SIXTEEN DIOSPOLITAN KINGS, .  | 269  |
| TURIN PAPYRUS, . . . . .  | 272  |
| THE HYKSOS INVASION, . . . . .  | 276  |
| THE ALLEGORY OF THE FLOOD, . . . . .  | 286  |
| FIFTEENTH DYNASTY OF ELEVEN DIOSPOLITAN KINGS, . .  | 298  |
| SIXTEENTH DYNASTY OF THIRTY-TWO THEBAID KINGS, . .  | 306  |
| THE HYKSOS DYNASTY OF SIX KINGS, . . . . .  | 315  |
| RESTORED LIST OF HYKSOS DYNASTY—NEW EMPIRE, . . .   | 335  |
| SOTHIAC LIST OF EIGHTEENTH DYNASTY, . . . . .   | 339  |
| THE EIGHTEENTH DYNASTY OF SIXTEEN DIOSPOLITAN KINGS,  | 340  |
| SETI, SETHOS, SETHOSIS, OR SESOSTRIS, . . . . .   | 354  |
| NINETEENTH DYNASTY OF SEVEN DIOSPOLITAN KINGS, . .  | 370  |
| NINETEENTH DYNASTY OF FIVE DIOSPOLITAN KINGS, . . .   | 371  |
| EPOCH-REIGNS OF MANETHO'S SECOND SOTHIAC CYCLE, . .   | 387  |

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| THE PERIOD OF JOSEPH'S ADMINISTRATION IN EGYPT, IN<br>THE LIGHT OF THE TEL-EL-AMARNA CLAY TABLETS, 391 |      |
| "THE PHARAOH OF THE OPPRESSION," . . . . .   | 425  |
| THE PHARAOH OF THE EXODUS, . . . . .   | 434  |
| THE IA-NIM, OR IONIANS, . . . . .  | 454  |
| THE 1,050 YEARS OF MANETHO'S THIRD BOOK, . . . . .   | 461  |
| TWENTIETH DYNASTY OF SEVEN DIOSPOLITAN KINGS, . . .  | 463  |
| TWENTY-FIRST DYNASTY OF SEVEN TANITE KINGS, . . .  | 470  |
| TWENTY-SECOND DYNASTY OF NINE BUBASTITE KINGS, . .   | 477  |
| TWENTY-THIRD DYNASTY OF THREE TANITE KINGS, . . .  | 492  |
| TWENTY-FOURTH DYNASTY OF FOUR SAITE KINGS, . . .   | 497  |
| TWENTY-FIFTH DYNASTY OF ETHIOPIAN KINGS, . . . .   | 512  |
| TWENTY-SIXTH DYNASTY OF SIX SAITE KINGS, . . . .   | 519  |
| BABYLONIAN AND ASSYRIAN CHRONOLOGY, . . . . .  | 534  |
| EPOCH-REIGNS OF MANETHO'S THIRD CYCLE, . . . . .   | 549  |
| EPOCH OF THOTH, 1324 B. C., . . . . .  | 550  |
| EPOCH OF PAOPHI, 1204 B. C., . . . . .   | 554  |
| EPOCH OF ATHYR, 1084 B. C., . . . . .  | 556  |
| EPOCH OF CHOIAHK, 946 B. C., . . . . .   | 557  |
| EPOCH OF TYBI, 844 B. C., . . . . .  | 560  |
| EPOCH OF AMHIR, 724 B. C., . . . . .   | 561  |
| EPOCH OF PHAMENOTH, 604 B. C., . . . . .   | 562  |
| EPOCH OF PHARMUTHI, 484 B. C., . . . . .   | 563  |
| EPOCH OF PACHONS, 364 B. C., . . . . .   | 564  |
| INDEX, . . . . .   | 567  |









3 2044 011 768 371

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED  
AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS  
NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON  
OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED  
BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE  
NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE  
BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

WIDENER  
BOOK DUE

MAR 31 1991

WIDENER  
BOOK DUE



WIDENER  
CANCELED

JAN 23 1992

Blank page with faint horizontal lines, possibly indicating text or a diagram.